

Willman, Charles E.    Worthen, Dale L.  
 Wills, Mark A.        Yamaura, Lawrence  
 Wilson, Daniel E.     Yates, William E., Jr.  
 Wilson, David E.     Yim, Gordon T. K. K.  
 Wilson, Frank E.     S.  
 Wilson, Haldon D., Jr. Youmans, Tommy B.  
 Wilson, Woodrow O., Jr. Young, Earl W., Jr.  
 Jr.                    Zaehring, Theodore  
 Winget, Harold W.    A.  
 Wise, Lawrence F., Jr. Zahn, Sylvan A., Jr.  
 Witt, Sherrill A.     Ziehler, Paul M.  
 Woollever, Robert A. Ziemann, Cornelius M.

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 18, 1966:

##### COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Nathan M. Koffsky, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

#### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEBRUARY 21, 1966.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.  
 JOHN W. MCCORMACK,  
 Speaker of the House of Representatives.

#### PRAYER

Rabbi Norman Zdanowitz, of the Congregation Beth Abraham, Auburn, Maine, offered the following prayer:

O Heavenly Father, inoculate with the radiance of Thy divine spirit those who are charged with the great responsibility of directing the affairs of our glorious and beloved country. Endow them with insight and foresight in this crucial period to champion and to safeguard mankind's inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Protect and sustain, strengthen and inspire our illustrious President, Vice President, and these distinguished leaders of this great Republic.

May the patriotism, wisdom, and courageous spirit of George Washington, whose birthday we reverently pause to celebrate tomorrow, ever serve as a lantern to illumine their path, to maintain a Government "which gives to bigotry no sanction and to persecution no assistance."

Vouchsafe Thy blessings upon the gallant men of our Armed Forces who have gone forth to arrest the reckless wave of unprovoked aggression and bloodshed on distant shores. Crown their efforts with triumph and enable them to achieve the suppression of tyranny and lawlessness.

May the United States remain a citadel of freedom and a watchtower from which rays of light and hope shall be beamed to those who are now living in darkness,

poverty, and despair. Hasten the day when the millennial hope of justice, peace, and brotherly love shall be established and will prevail throughout the world. Amen.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

#### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 17, 1966, was read and approved.

#### DEATH OF ADM. CHESTER W. NIMITZ

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, another of the great heroes of World War II has disappeared with the death yesterday of Admiral of the Fleet Chester W. Nimitz.

Admiral Nimitz had spent all but 15 of his 81 years in the service of the U.S. Navy. In World War I he served in the Atlantic Fleet with a submarine division in a day when submarines were regarded as strange military instruments. In World War II he assumed command of our shattered forces at Pearl Harbor and 2 years later led the Pacific Fleet to victory in the battles of the Coral Sea, Midway, Tarawa, and the Marianas. His name is synonymous with many of the historic sea engagements of World War II.

Admiral Nimitz was a superb leader and a highly knowledgeable technician. He was the builder of the Navy's first diesel engine, the designer and builder of the first naval forward repair stations and maintenance squadrons which overcame a prime weakness in the naval fleet in the Pacific and contributed enormously to naval victories in that area.

Admiral Nimitz commanded a thousand ships and 2 million men and saw the successful culmination of the efforts of the Pacific Fleet from the deck of the U.S.S. *Missouri* when the Japanese capitulation was signed on September 2, 1945.

Throughout his long career he was five times awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for wartime exploits, received most of the Navy's highest decorations, and wide recognition for his outstanding service. While honors were showered upon him, he was no less honored and loved for his poise under fire, his tact and understanding, and his down-to-earth attitude.

All Americans mourn the passing of this great naval hero who defended our country so long and well.

I extend my sympathy to his family and loved ones.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like my statement to follow the remarks which will appear in the RECORD by the distinguished majority leader relative to the death on yesterday of one of the great leaders of our country in World War II.

The name of Admiral Nimitz became as famous and as well known as any hero in the history of our Nation during World War II, when he commanded the greatest fleet ever assembled—over 1,000 fighting ships and well over a million fighting men—which conquered island after island in the Pacific, and which led to our victory over the Japanese Empire.

Our Nation has lost one of its greatest heroes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana on the passing of the great Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz.

All Americans have cause to mourn the passing of this great American who served his country so well in war and peace.

Mr. Speaker, Sunday, February 20, 1966, marked the passing of one of our Nation's most famous admirals who died at his home on Yerba Buena Island, Calif.

Admiral Nimitz commanded the most powerful fleet the world has ever known in driving the Japanese Navy from the Pacific Ocean in World War II. He took over the shattered U.S. fleet shortly after the attack on Pearl Harbor and nurtured its recovery and growth into a force of 16,000 aircraft, 5,000 ships, and 2 million men—the mightiest armada ever assembled.

It was a distinct honor for me to have served in the Pacific Fleet under Admiral Nimitz during this crucial period of time in our history.

On September 1, 1945, Fleet Admiral Nimitz was one of the signers of the United States when Japan formally signed the surrender terms aboard the battleship *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay.

On October 5, 1945, which had been officially designated as "Nimitz Day" in Washington, D.C., Admiral Nimitz was personally presented a Gold Star in lieu of the third Distinguished Service Medal by the President of the United States "For exceptionally meritorious service as commander in chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas, from June 1944 to August 1945."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the text of the citation which accompanied the Gold Star presentation on October 5, 1945, at this point in the RECORD.

The citation follows:

Initiating the final phase in the battle for victory in the Pacific, [he] attacked the Marianas, invading Saipan, inflicting a decisive defeat in the Japanese Fleet in the first battle of the Philippines and capturing Guam and Tinian. In vital continuing operations, his Fleet Forces isolated the enemy-held bastions of the Central and Eastern Carolines and secured in quick succession Peleliu, Angaur, and Ulithi. With reconnaissance of the main beaches on Leyte effected, approach channels cleared and opposition neutralized in joint operations to reoccupy the Philippines, the challenge by powerful task forces of the Japanese Fleet

resulted in a historic victory in the three-phased battle for Leyte Gulf, October 24 to 26, 1944. \* \* \* Fleet Admiral Nimitz culminated long-range strategy by successful amphibious assault on Iwo Jima and Okinawa \* \* \* finally placed representative forces of the U.S. Navy in the harbor of Tokyo for the formal capitulation of the Japanese Empire. \* \* \* He demonstrated the highest qualities of a naval officer and rendered services of the greatest distinction to his country.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the text of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy to all naval personnel at this point in the RECORD.

The message of the Secretary of the Navy dated February 21, 1966, follows:

From: The Secretary of the Navy.

To: ALNAV.

Unclas.

The Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and I join with all Navy and Marine Corps uniformed and civilian personnel in mourning the death of Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, U.S. Navy, in San Francisco, on Sunday, February 20.

During his lifetime, marked by many significant accomplishments in the naval service, he was an inspiration to all of us. He graduated with distinction in the Naval Academy class of 1905 and served in various ships, and commanded two, before undergoing submarine training. After many more commands and duties, he laid one of the cornerstones in the foundation of the Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps program when he installed and instructed in one of the first units at the University of California at Berkeley.

He was designated commander in chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet, on December 17, 1941, and led U.S. forces in the Pacific Ocean area to victory, culminating in the signing of the surrender documents on U.S.S. *Missouri* on September 1, 1945, in Tokyo Bay. He relieved Fleet Adm. Ernest J. King as chief of naval operations in December 1945 and served in that capacity for 2 years. He was then assigned as Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy with offices in San Francisco. There he continued to serve his country in many ways, always with distinction. His passing is a great loss to the U.S. Navy and to the Nation, but his deeds and character will be an inspiration and standard for us all in the years to come. Typical of Fleet Admiral Nimitz, he requested simple ceremonies incident to his burial at the Golden Gate National Cemetery, a final resting place close to the service personnel who died in the Pacific. Fleet Admiral Nimitz will be buried on Thursday, February 24.

PAUL H. NITZE,  
Secretary of the Navy.

#### ADM. CHESTER W. NIMITZ

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to join in paying tribute to the memory of Adm. Chester W. Nimitz. He was truly a great American, a hero of the highest tradition.

I will leave it to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] and others to speak more extensively of this great man but I wanted to be recorded among those who cherished him as a friend and held

him in highest esteem as a patriot to whom all Americans owe a debt of gratitude.

#### FLEET ADM. CHESTER W. NIMITZ

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, with the death of Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, which occurred on yesterday, this Nation has lost the last of its five-star sailors who directed America's triumphant naval operations in the Pacific during World War II. Admiral Nimitz, as commander in chief, Pacific Fleet, masterminded some of the greatest and most decisive victories in naval history. History will undoubtedly recognize him as one of the great naval strategists of all time.

Admiral Nimitz was born at Fredericksburg, Tex., in the district I represent, on February 24, 1885, in a pioneer home, built of native stone. That old home is still occupied by members of his mother's family.

The admiral's paternal relatives lived a block away in the famous old Nimitz Hotel. That landmark was erected by the admiral's grandfather, Charles H. Nimitz, in 1852. The latter had been a merchant mariner and when he had been unable to return to his briny deep, he built the Nimitz in the shape of a ship. Gen. Robert E. Lee, on a frontier inspection trip, once signed the register at the Nimitz.

The admiral was the son of Chester Bernhard and Anna (Henke) Nimitz. His paternal great-grandparents, Charles Henrich and Meta (Meirrotte) Nimitz, came from Bremen, Germany, in 1843, and settled in Charleston, S.C. Shortly after that they resettled at Fredericksburg. There he grew up, and graduated from nearby Kerrville High School.

After graduating from the U.S. Naval Academy, seventh in his 1905 class, Nimitz progressed steadily and was promoted to rear admiral on June 23, 1938.

Following that, he distinguished himself with many assignments, and was well prepared for the great challenge that faced him on December 17, 1941, when he took over as commander in chief, Pacific Fleet.

Building from a navy that was in shambles, Admiral Nimitz lost no time. By August of 1945, when Japan surrendered, Nimitz had under his command what has been described as the greatest armada under one flag in history—6,256 ships of all types, and 14,847 combat aircraft. In addition to the regular Navy personnel, he also commanded six divisions of marines.

Faced with a formidable task, upon assumption of command of the Pacific Fleet Admiral Nimitz regrouped and reorganized his forces, and laid plans for new ships and a war plan to cope with the powerful Japanese naval fleet, bol-

stered by the infamous and disastrous attack at Pearl Harbor.

The first major clash occurred on May 4, 1942, in the Battle of the Coral Sea, a 5-day engagement. A spectacular victory resulted, and the threat to New Zealand and Australia was averted.

A month later came the Battle of Midway, and again the Nimitz strategy brought another great naval victory. After these two victories the admiral was later quoted as saying the eventual defeat of the Japanese was just a question of time. And he was right.

I last saw Admiral Nimitz at Fredericksburg on the occasion of the visit of German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, who was entertained at the nearby LBJ Ranch by the then Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson. The admiral flew in from San Francisco to join in the great public reception that was accorded the distinguished German visitor.

The admiral numbered his relatives who make their home in his native country by the hundreds. And his friends and admirers there could be counted in the thousands. He loved his old home, his relatives, and his friends who make their homes in Gillespie, Kerr, and surrounding counties.

Mr. Speaker, history has recorded in detail the blow-by-blow triumphs of the U.S. Navy and the Marines in the Pacific, under the brilliant command of the admiral whose death we mourn today. This Nation, and all men who cherish freedom, are forever indebted to this great American patriot.

#### HEALTH INSTRUCTION AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION: CONGRESS SHOULD AMEND THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, as we Americans increase our standard of living, the many modern conveniences that make our lives easier and more pleasant lead us toward physical inertia. We sit more and walk less. We are spectators more and participants less. We use power brakes, power steering, and power golf carts. We are now blessed with electric can openers, electric carving knives, and electric toothbrushes. It would not surprise me someday to see even our push buttons equipped with power assists.

Yet, modern life moves with an increasingly faster pace. The demands on our energies are growing. We have more work and less time in which to complete it. We face more pressure and feel greater strain. Even the activities of our leisure time are pursued with frenzy.

Confronted by these strenuous demands, we must not allow the benefits of progress to sap our vitality.

I am today introducing a bill to amend title III and title XI of the National Defense Education Act. These amendments will help encourage health and physical

education, just as the National Defense Education Act has stimulated academic progress.

The Congress has been urged to "amend the present national defense educational law so as to provide long needed assistance to the States to foster excellence in physical education." Vice President HUMPHREY recommended this in 1962, and I am pleased to sponsor legislation that seeks to make this suggestion a reality.

Just as it is important that our Nation meet its obligation to the development and training of childrens' intellectual capacities, it is also our obligation to assure their proper health and physical development. The eminent physician and heart specialist, Dr. Paul Dudley White, has said that "it is little short of criminal to educate our young people mentally, to have them die early of heart attacks and strokes; for example, at 40, because of neglect of their physical health."

The more we learn about the interrelationship of mind and body, the more it becomes clear that the ability to learn depends a great deal upon physical well-being. Yet, a hard look at the physical condition of many Americans is alarming.

On an average day, 1½ million Americans cannot get to work because of illness. Over a million are out of work for a week or more.

One out of five children cannot pass a simple test of physical performance.

Nearly 28 million Americans have some degree of physical disability. More than one-half of the population is significantly overweight. One-third of all American young men are judged to be unfit for duty in the Armed Forces for health reasons.

Like so many human problems, this pattern of physical neglect begins early in life. The place to correct it is with our young. For example, obesity begins early, and over one-third of American children are overweight. Poor dietary habits in adults are not so surprising when one recognizes that boys and girls in the 13 to 15 age bracket are the least likely of any age group to be eating proper foods. The worst offenders are teenage girls, tomorrow's homemakers and meal planners.

We should concentrate on adequate health and physical education programs in our public schools. Congress has rightfully established and supported a number of programs to strengthen the academic, vocational, and technical efforts of the Nation's public schools. Now we must recognize the need to do the same for the health and physical education departments. The bill I am introducing is designed to do just that.

The legislation I am sponsoring has two features. The first would amend title III of the National Defense Education Act to provide financial encouragement for classroom instruction in health and physical education. The second provision would amend title XI. This section would be revised so that regular session or short-term instruction would be available to those now teaching or planning to teach school health physical education. No Federal money would be spent for athletic equipment.

By amending titles III and XI of the National Defense Education Act, we can promote this needed health education and can move forward to attune our physical capabilities to the strenuous requirements of the 1960's. We can follow the example set and the goal urged by President Kennedy when he resolved that "by keeping physical fitness in the forefront of the Nation's concerns, the Federal Government can make a substantial contribution toward improving the health and vigor of our citizens."

#### BIRTHDAY SALUTE TO THE GAMBIA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am privileged and happy to announce that on Friday last, when we were not in session, the newest of the emerging nations of Africa, The Gambia, celebrated its first anniversary of independence.

I treasure as one of the rich memories of my service as a delegate to the 20th General Assembly of the United Nations all the details of that day last September when I, with many others, from many lands, stood with bared heads as the flag of The Gambia, just admitted as the 115th member of the United Nations, for the first time was proudly raised in appropriate ceremonies in front of the United Nations headquarters.

The Gambia is a former British colony and protectorate comprising a narrow strip of land along the lower 288 miles of the Gambia River in west Africa and stretching inland to a point 200 miles from the sea.

The territory is closely bound up with the river, which gives unequaled access to the interior of west Africa, for it is navigable by oceangoing vessels at all seasons for more than 200 miles from its mouth.

Under the new constitution, which entered into effect on April 27, 1962, The Gambia has achieved a considerable degree of self-government.

During World War II, The Gambia contributed soldiers for the Burmese campaign and served as an air stop and port of call for naval convoys.

The Gambia is naturally situated to handle the overseas trade of a large hinterland. The river, which steamers ply regularly, is the country's principal means of communication. There are about 30 river stations in the country. The only seaport is Bathurst.

The output of The Gambia is primarily agricultural. Some subsistence crops are raised, chiefly grain sorghum, but not enough to feed the inhabitants. Nearly all suitable land is planted with peanuts grown for export. Peanuts normally comprise 95 percent of total annual exports by value. The customs duty on these exports provides most of The

Gambia's revenue. Other exports are palm kernels, hides, and beeswax. Cash crops pay for most of the inhabitants' requirements, including rice, a staple of their diet, and kola nuts. The leading imports are cotton cloth, foodstuffs, and hardware.

Local industries are limited to cotton weaving, garmentmaking, and fishing. Most of the overseas trade is carried in British ships. There is a British preferential tariff on imports. The monetary unit is the West African pound, at par with sterling.

While The Gambia follows a formal policy of nonalignment, it maintains particularly close and friendly relations with the United Kingdom, Senegal, and other African Commonwealth states. Although its representation abroad and its participation in international conferences is limited, The Gambia takes an active interest in international and particularly African affairs. It became a member of the Organization of African Unity in March 1965, and was admitted to the United Nations as that organization's 115th member in September of the same year.

The United States favors the expansion and strengthening of friendly ties with the people of The Gambia, and their orderly and progressive development in the political, social, and economic spheres and in friendly cooperation with their neighbors.

For myself, I extend sincere and warm congratulations to the Prime Minister of The Gambia, the Honorable Dawda Kairaba Jawara, and to all the people of the proud land of The Gambia on the occasion of the first anniversary of the independence of their nation.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the 18th of February marked the 1st anniversary of the independence of The Gambia. Although belatedly, we take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Dawda Kairaba Jawara, The Gambian Prime Minister, and to the wonderful people of this African country.

On February 18, 1965, the Union Jack of Great Britain was replaced by The Gambia's red, blue, green, and white flag in Bathurst, the capital of The Gambia. Situated on the west coast of Africa, this small country is bisected by the Gambia River and bordered on three sides by Senegal. Gambia has been a separate entity in Africa since 1888 when it became a British Crown Colony. Under its 1962 Constitution The Gambia received full internal self-government in October of 1963. The political structure is a traditional British one, with a unicameral legislature, elected by universal adult suffrage, and a cabinet led by Prime Minister David K. Jawara.

The Gambia's economy is almost exclusively agricultural, peanuts being the main cash crop and accounting for about 95 percent of the country's exports. There is some local industry, including peanut oil refining, cotton weaving, garmentmaking, and fishing. During the past year The Gambia has continued to look for ways of diversifying its agriculture and increasing output. The

Government is utilizing swamplands along the Gambia River for rice production. Gambia is to be commended for the economic success it has achieved, in view of the lack of mineral resources and the inadequacy of its agricultural resources—very poor, sandy soil in the uplands and swamps along the river which are often flooded in the wet season.

Great Britain and The Gambia continue to benefit from the close relationship begun in 1888. The Gambia has actively undertaken to improve her relations with Senegal during this past year.

Moreover, this African country has entered the world community through acceptance into the United Nations on September 22, 1965. Prime Minister Jawara visited New York City this past fall to acknowledge his country's entry into the United Nations.

It gives me great pleasure to congratulate Prime Minister Jawara and the people of The Gambia on their first anniversary of independence. We know they will continue to enjoy the blessings of steady economic progress and political stability in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members so desiring may have 5 legislative days in which to join me in a birthday salute to The Gambia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### EYE CARE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend the act which regulates the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia. This act was approved on May 28, 1924, and has not been amended during the more than 40 years which have intervened. Prior to its enactment, all of the 48 States which then constituted our Union, had enacted laws to regulate the practice of optometry. Every one of those laws has since 1924 been amended; most of them several times.

The Washington Daily News, the past few days, has reported that men who are not required to meet any educational or technical standards are now fitting customers with contact lenses. These men are not licensed, regulated, or supervised in any manner. From the News report, it is apparent that some of the work they are doing may be inadequate and unsanitary. In at least one case, a woman lost the sight of an eye.

Two men have been arrested and charged with violating the District's 42-year-old optometry law. According to the News, one of their reporters who sought to secure contact lenses did not have a doctor's prescription and was not even sent to a doctor to secure one. The

salesman attempted to figure out the prescription from the glasses the reporter was wearing. This is highly dangerous, as not everyone can be fitted with contact lenses and those that can wear them generally need a different prescription from the one given them for their spectacles. The contact lenses may cause an abrasion of the eyeball, which, if infected, may result in the total loss of the eye.

Even if the accused are convicted, the existing law does not adequately protect the public from those operators who, according to the News report, are at best bilking the public out of its money, and at the worst, damaging their customer's eyesight. The News reports that frequently the unsuspecting public believes it is being served by licensed and well regulated vision specialists.

High-powered advertisements and fancy but expensive installment plans that conceal high rates of interest are being used to sell a health device which, when properly prescribed and fitted, can be highly beneficial to the user; but, on the other hand, it may be, and often is, highly dangerous.

President Johnson is well aware of the importance of vision. Pursuant to a joint resolution of the Congress, approved December 30, 1963, the President, on January 28 of this year, issued his Save Your Vision Week proclamation. He began it with a quotation from Shakespeare:

He that is stricken blind cannot forget the precious treasure of his eyesight lost.

He went on to say:

Those words of Shakespeare are relevant to us today as we proclaim Save Your Vision Week, 1966. They remind us that the gift of sight is one of the glories of life. To the child it is a red balloon—a mother's smile—a form in a passing cloud—a tree with autumn leaves.

Those words of Shakespeare remind us, too, that the eyesight which most of us take for granted in our daily lives can be snatched from any of us, almost without warning.

He then listed the optometric profession as one concerned with programs for the improvement and preservation of vision. As a matter of fact, optometry is the first line of defense against blindness and is dedicated to improving and conserving the vision of our entire population.

The members of this profession were the first to volunteer their services in the war on poverty. Last summer through their organization called Volunteers for Vision, they made an outstanding contribution to Project Headstart for pre-school children. The honorary chairman of Volunteers for Vision is Miss Luci Baines Johnson.

This Congress and the preceding Congress have wisely included schools and colleges of optometry and optometry students in the health education legislation authorizing the expenditure of Federal funds for the expansion and improvement of the health professions by providing more and better educational and library facilities.

Most of you will recall the battle which medicine and dentistry fought to eliminate fraudulent and deceptive advertis-

ing from their profession. Today optometry is fighting the same battle and has succeeded in most of the States of the Union. But, unfortunately, this is not true in our Nation's Capital.

As far back as 1955, the U.S. Supreme Court, in the case of Williams against Lee Optical, sustained the Oklahoma law which contained provisions similar to provisions in the bill just introduced. The Court held that "State regulation of advertising relating to eye examinations was a matter reasonably and rationally related to the health and welfare of the people." The Court went further and reversed the lower court, which struck down the provision of the Oklahoma law relating to the sale of eyeglass frames. In sustaining the statute the Supreme Court said:

If the advertisement of lenses is to be abolished or controlled, the advertising of frames must come under the same restraints; or so the legislature might think. We see no constitutional reason why a State may not treat all who deal with the human eye as members of a profession who should use no merchandising methods for obtaining customers.

That is one of the purposes of the bill which I have introduced.

Last year the Senate Subcommittee on Frauds and Misrepresentations Affecting the Elderly included among its many recommendations the following statement:

Testimony taken by this subcommittee reveals that the last congressional action in this field (eye care) within the District dates back to 1924. Testimony taken by this subcommittee suggests that new merchandising methods have occurred since that action, and it is recommended that the Senate District of Columbia Committee examine the adequacy of present District laws on—

(a) Widespread fixed-price advertising for regular glasses and contact lenses;

(b) Sale of over-the-counter nonprescription glasses;

(c) Possible need for greater authority to the District Commissioners for regulation of the corporate practice of optometry.

My proposal contains appropriately worded sections to correct the problems uncovered by this Senate subcommittee.

Under date of January 7, 1966, Dr. Zachary Ephraim, president of the Board of Optometry of the District of Columbia, addressed a letter to the President of the District Board of Commissioners, in which he transmitted a draft of a bill which had been prepared by the Board of Optometry in cooperation with the District of Columbia Department of Occupations and Professions, the Optometric Society of the District of Columbia, and the American Optometric Association. It was designed to improve the District law as it pertains to the practice of optometry. The bill I have proposed contains all of the essential provisions of the Board's draft. As pointed out in Dr. Ephraim's letter, there is nothing in it that is not now contained in the laws of one or more of the States. The purpose of the revision is to bring the standards of practice in the city of Washington up to a level which exists in most of our States and it will provide adequate protection for the visual needs of persons seeking vision care within the District of Columbia.

As the Nation's Capital, we have visitors from all over the world and from every part of our country. They are entitled to the same high standards for the practice of optometry which prevail in their home communities. Mr. Speaker, that is the purpose of the bill which I have introduced. I hope that it will receive prompt and favorable action by the House District Committee and the House of Representatives itself.

#### THOSE WHO COUNT

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker—

America has the courage, the will, and the resources to defend the frontlines of freedom against the tide of Communist aggression.

These words appeared recently in an editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer, which properly believes that America's purpose and commitment in Vietnam were made a matter of formal public record in the historic Hawaii meeting.

Meanwhile, the newspaper states:

With Vice President HUMPHREY accompanying the South Vietnamese leaders back to Saigon on the first leg of an extensive diplomatic mission to rally the forces of freedom in Asia, the implementation of policies agreed upon at Honolulu is underway.

Even as the war goes on, the Inquirer believes:

There will be an acceleration of cooperative programs by American and South Vietnamese officials to improve the economy of South Vietnam, raise the living standards, fight hunger and disease and build the foundations of a democratic, self-governing society.

The Inquirer is convinced that:

The United States, in alliance with South Vietnam, holds the trump cards—in military power, in economic resources, and in the moral issue of self-determination versus Communist enslavement.

This is an impressive, forthright summation of the situation and I would like to make it available to others by having it printed in the RECORD.

#### THE DECLARATION OF HONOLULU

America's purpose in Vietnam, and America's commitment to the South Vietnamese Government and people, have been made a matter of formal public record in the historic conference at Honolulu.

With the return of President Johnson and his advisers to Washington, and with Vice President HUMPHREY accompanying the South Vietnamese leaders back to Saigon on the first leg of an extensive diplomatic mission to rally the forces of freedom in Asia, the implementation of policies agreed upon at Honolulu is underway.

What, precisely, are these policies proclaimed jointly by the United States and South Vietnam?

Essentially, they are a mutual resolve to frustrate Communist attempts to conquer the territory and people of South Vietnam by armed aggression and terrorism.

The Red assaults will be countered by defensive military action, of whatever intensity is required and for as long as necessary.

Tireless efforts to achieve a negotiated peace will continue.

Meanwhile, even as the war goes on, there will be an acceleration of cooperative programs by American and South Vietnamese officials to improve the economy of South Vietnam, raise the living standards, fight hunger and disease, and build the foundations of a democratic, self-governing society.

How, it is being asked in some quarters, are these noble goals of freedom and peace and democracy—so solemnly proclaimed in the Declaration of Honolulu—to be achieved when the Communist North Vietnamese refuse to negotiate and when the South Vietnamese vow never to recognize the Red Vietcong?

There is no clear answer because, in our judgment, it is the wrong question. The wailing voices of woe, who call constantly for an American surrender in Vietnam, manage always and very conveniently to overlook the problems confronting the Communists.

The United States, in alliance with South Vietnam, holds the trump cards—in military power, in economic resources, and in the moral issue of self-determination versus Communist enslavement.

We believe that Ho Chi Minh and his comrades in Hanoi are the ones who ought to be worrying the most about escalation of the war—and we suspect they are.

America has the courage, the will, and the resources to defend the frontlines of freedom against the tide of Communist aggression. Let this be the message Vice President HUMPHREY conveys.

#### ALLOWANCE OF TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR MOVING EXPENSES

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, today it is my pleasure to introduce a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to avoid tax discrimination against the construction worker.

These builders of America have been truly the forgotten and neglected people of our generation. Too often their needs have been given a back seat to the less meritorious demands of more entrenched groups.

Specifically, the inequity which I hope to correct is in the allowance of deductions for moving expenses for workers of the trades and crafts of the construction industry.

The Internal Revenue Code provides a general rule that:

There shall be allowed as a deduction moving expenses \* \* \* in connection with the commencement of work by the taxpayer as an employee at a new principal place of work. (Internal Revenue Code 217.)

This is a good principle, Mr. Speaker, and it has general application for almost everyone except those who need it most—the construction worker.

The code goes on, in its conditions for allowance of the deduction, to provide time limitations and other requirements which virtually eliminate the construction worker. In short, the effect is that the worse a construction worker needs

this deduction, and the more he really deserves it—the less his actual chances are of obtaining it—Internal Revenue Code, section 217(c)(2).

This, Mr. Speaker, is the inequity my bill is designed to correct and it is my sincere hope that my colleagues will see its merit and offer their active support for this amendment.

#### FOOD FOR FREEDOM

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson said in his food-for-freedom message:

A balance between agricultural productivity and population is necessary to prevent the shadow of hunger from becoming a nightmare of famine.

This last week, at the gracious invitation of Chairman COOLEY of the House Committee on Agriculture, I was privileged to hear 10 distinguished experts submit their predictions and then offer their recommendations as to how this "nightmare of famine" might be avoided.

Their recommendations fell into two broad categories, as I understood them: First. Make every effort to reduce rates of population growth.

Second. Make every effort to increase agricultural productivity in these same lands faced with the blight of famine closing in over them.

Every witness emphasized that there was no apparent means of providing adequate food for those who have joined the banquet of life while the population explosion becomes more violent. The last witness, Prof. Theodore Schultz, of the University of Chicago, urged that adequate American agricultural resources be devoted to providing food for those now starving; that we follow the recommendations of the President in assisting our friends to modernize their agriculture; and that we allocate a portion of the funds received from the sale of food for freedom to family planning and birth control activities.

I offered this last idea to the House in a speech made following the President's message. Since then, I have explored it more fully, and considered it in the light of the remarks of these outstanding experts which have appeared before the distinguished Committee on Agriculture. I should like to offer it in more detail today, so that it may be further discussed and improved.

On February 14, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] introduced the food-for-freedom bill, H.R. 12785. Section 103(b) of title I includes a provision that the President may determine that foreign currencies may be received as payment for food for freedom in order to implement certain purposes defined by subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e) of section 304. I suggest that section 103(b) be extended to include a new subsection (i) of section 304.

I suggest that to section 304 be added a new subsection (i), which might read as follows:

For financing programs emphasizing maternal, child health and nutrition, and family planning services, and research activities related to the problems of population growth, for which purpose not less than fifteen per centum of the currencies received pursuant to title I shall be available, through and under the procedures established by the President upon request of the country with which the agreement is made: *Provided*, That the President is authorized to carry out the foregoing provisions of this subsection through any agency of the United States, or any international agency and/or organization of which the United States is a member, and which he determines is qualified to administer such activities.

This would mean that food for freedom would be used twice: once, to help fill empty stomachs now; and twice, to avoid empty stomachs in the future. This is the basic merit of the idea.

Now let us explore the idea in somewhat more detail. It suggests providing a total family service—to the mother, to her children, and to the entire family group. It is directed to the health, well-being, and happiness of all of them. And if the program were implemented as a unit—directed to the mother, father, and the children, it would achieve its greatest effectiveness at the least cost.

Dr. W. H. Sebrell, Jr., director of the School of Nutrition Sciences at Columbia University, testified before the committee:

Protein calorie malnutrition is actually one of the largest causes of the death of children. It is estimated that 70 per cent of the children in developing areas suffer from malnutrition and upward of 3 million children die annually from malnutrition, largely of this type. This fact is hidden because these deaths often are recorded as being from diarrhea, parasites, and infectious diseases. If these children were well nourished, they would not die of the intercurrent diseases. In those millions it does not kill, malnutrition permanently impairs their growth and probably causes irreversible mental and emotional damage. The mother's ignorance is of the greatest importance to the nutrition of the small child in that she does not recognize that the child is suffering from malnutrition.

My provision would look to this child health and nutrition problem. It would look to the health of the mother. And it would provide her, if she wished, information on family planning and birth control, so that she and her husband might space and number their family in the manner in which they feel they could best support it. Therefore, this provision would assist the parents, and offer them personal help.

It would assist the children, now being, and those unborn, to better realize their potentials, and it would move to eliminate the social and political instability which accompanies hunger and frustration.

What of the other part of the problem—providing more food for the total increases in population which will occur, even if family planning programs are given a great push. In his message, President Johnson said:

Many of the developing countries urgently need to give a higher priority to improving

and modernizing their own production and distribution of food.

Section 103 of title I of the bill introduced by Chairman COOLEY says "take into account efforts of countries to help themselves toward a greater degree of self-reliance, especially in providing enough food to meet the needs of their people, and the resources required to attain that objective." The bill is intended to help increase the agriculture productivity of nations as rapidly as possible—which is the other side of the coin.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe the addition of the section I have suggested would round out this important legislation, and make it a total attack on hunger, deprivation, and the terror of famine. Today, unlimited population growth is on a collision course with limited food supply. Only total attack will avert disaster.

#### OUR FRIENDS, THE FEDS

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, my friend Opie L. Shelton, executive vice president and general manager of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, has long since established himself as a man of unusual clarity and vision. One of his many services to Atlanta and the State of Georgia is his continuing attempt to effect a realistic attitude toward the Federal Government. I laud his most recent effort, an article in the February issue of Atlanta magazine. It is a forceful presentation, and I include it at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Atlanta Magazine, February 1966]

#### OUR FRIENDS, THE FEDS

(By Opie L. Shelton)

The reason Atlanta has become partners with the Federal Government in so many projects is that Georgia's State government has failed to enter the world of reality where her cities are concerned.

The old county unit system, one of the greatest calamities any State ever experienced, was the prime villain. It placed the absolute control of State government in the hands of people who were openly antagonistic to the cities. Atlanta was their favorite whipping boy.

Today Atlanta receives less financial assistance from the State than any of the largest 25 cities of the Nation. Even though the county unit has been abolished (courtesy of the Federal Government) many of the people who run the State still think in county unit fashion. They still don't understand the problem, nor do many of them seem to want to understand.

Georgia has moved from a rural to an urban society, but so far as the State government's reaction to urban needs are concerned one might think we were still living in a cotton-dominated economy.

The State highway department is a good example. If it had not been for the Federal Government we wouldn't have even the pitifully few major thoroughfares we have today. That department's philosophy has been so politically-oriented that the cities have been

systematically shunted aside when the highway tax dollar has been divided.

State government that isn't responsive to the needs of its cities is soon going to find itself \* \* \* useless \* \* \*. America will double its population by the year 2000, we are told, and better than 90 percent of that growth is going to be in urban areas.

The Federal Government appears to understand these simple facts of life. And that is why Atlanta and every other growing city is forced to beat a path to Washington. A city that is treated as an unwanted child must, of necessity, seek a foster parent.

Most of the people who yell loudest about States' rights and cry havoc about big Federal Government are those who have done the least to exercise the responsibilities that go along with States' rights. They are phonies and frauds to the core.

If State governments are to survive they had better take inventory and begin to exercise better judgment in their treatment of their cities.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AGENCIES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies of the Select Committee on Small Business have permission to sit this afternoon during general debate; and I make the same request for Wednesday and Thursday of this week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### WATCH THE TROJAN HORSE

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Senator KENNEDY and others would have us welcome the Vietcong into the process of settling the fighting in Vietnam by inviting them to be a part of any future government there.

History indicates that this course would be full of danger.

In this connection, it is appropriate to quote the words of the distinguished historian, Samuel Eliot Morison, in his recently published "Oxford History of the American People." Writing about the Iron Curtain and the diplomatic mistakes which the Allies made at the close of the war, he says:

The final mistake was the assumption that a joint regime, Communist and non-Communist, would work in defeated or liberated countries, like the "popular front" governments before the war.

Later, he says:

The event proved that no popular front with Communists could have any other result but a Communist Party takeover.

It is clear that we must proceed carefully in this respect. This does not mean that Vietcong, as individual South Vietnamese, would not be listened to along with Buddhists, Catholics, Montagnards, North Vietnamese exiles, and

others. It would mean, however, that they would not be given an opportunity to move into sensitive government departments and take over by indirection as was done in Eastern Europe.

It is also educational to recall President Kennedy's statement in Berlin, in 1963, when he said:

I am not impressed by the opportunities open to popular fronts throughout the world. I do not believe that any democrat can successfully ride that tiger.

Recent dispatches from Peiping and Hanoi have suggested growing doubts about the conduct of their military effort, the strain on the economy, and the resulting emergence of a peace element.

Now is the time to emphasize firmness rather than vacillation.

#### TELEVISIONING OF HOUSE PROCEEDINGS

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the eyes of the Nation last week were focused on the South Vietnam hearings conducted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Most of the appraisals of the hearings that I have heard on this side of the Congress have been very unfavorable, but I submit to the Speaker—and I speak primarily to the House majority floor leader and the Speaker of the House—that there is one thing we should have learned from these hearings: Under no circumstances should we ever permit House proceedings to be televised. The televising of House proceedings, Mr. Speaker, is the most effective way I know to convert serious deliberative proceedings into a first-class comedy.

#### RADIO FREE ASIA

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have this morning sent a letter to Mr. Crawford H. Greenewalt, chairman of the board of directors of Radio Free Europe, urging that his organization investigate the feasibility of establishing a Radio Free Asia in an effort to counteract the relentless barrage of hate propaganda now being disseminated by the Communist Chinese throughout southeast Asia.

My admiration and respect for Radio Free Europe is boundless. It has been, and continues to be, one of the most effective private means of disseminating truth to the captive nations of Eastern Europe ever devised in modern society. It is my hope that a similar effort can

and will be made in the strife-ridden areas of Asia.

With your permission I should like to read the text of my letter to Mr. Greenewalt and urge my distinguished colleagues to associate themselves with it if they share my belief that a Radio Free Asia can be an important ally in our struggle for the minds of Asia's peoples:

DEAR MR. GREENEWALT: It is imperative that our Nation, through its private citizens as well as through its Government, do everything possible to offset the fantastic volume of vicious propaganda now being drummed into the minds of the Asian peoples by the Red Chinese.

Since World War II, few organizations have done a more effective job of presenting the truth to captive nations and their people than Radio Free Europe. Most of the time the only access the peoples of Eastern Europe have to the truth is through our own Government's agency, the Voice of America and through Radio Free Europe.

It becomes increasingly apparent, in these perilous times in Asia, that there is a grave and pressing need for an operation similar to Radio Free Europe in this part of the world. Communist propagandists are expending millions of dollars and thousands of hours of air time in an unceasing barrage of hatred against America and the free world.

We must counteract this relentless campaign through every effective channel available to us as a free country.

I therefore strongly urge that you and the members of the board of your organization give serious consideration to the formation of a Radio Free Asia. Such action, I am convinced, will assist the official agencies of our own Government and those of other free nations in this world in their effort to win the minds of millions away from the seductive and totalitarian influence of Red China.

The bulk of the world's population lives in this troubled and terror-stricken region. There is no doubt, whatever, that the Chinese Communist regime recognizes the pivotal role the commitment of these millions of human beings will play in their quest for world domination.

Our American Government and its people stand firmly against the encroachment of communism in southeast Asia. We have made our stand known through economic assistance and through the commitment of men and arms to aid South Vietnam in its heroic fight against aggression from the North.

We must seek to win the propaganda war as well. And in that war there is no greater weapon than truth.

The American people should be given the opportunity to enlist in that struggle through a voluntary, nonprofit, nongovernmental agency in addition to all the official effort now being made. Radio Free Asia can become a reality. I pray that you, the members of your board and the expert advisers you have working with you may be able to make it so.

#### "LOVE-INS"

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, according to U.S. News & World Report of February 28, 1966, the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County has ordered an

inquiry into what one of the supervisors terms "love-ins," permitted under the welfare program in Los Angeles.

At issue is a rule which permits aid to a family with dependent children, even though the man who lives in the house is neither married to the mother nor is the father of the children.

Said Supervisor Frank G. Bonelli:

We have had sit-ins and lie-ins, and now we have love-ins. This places a stigma and indictment upon supervisors unless we actively challenge this phase of the welfare program.

Taxpayers must not be forced to subsidize any welfare program that has the inherent danger of promoting illegitimacy, to say nothing about apparent outright immorality.

#### RESOLUTION TO BAR DISCRIMINATION AGAINST U.S. EMPLOYEES

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution calling for an end to discrimination in the assignment of U.S. employees to overseas posts.

The administration has been practicing religious discrimination in its assignment of employees abroad, thereby preventing assignment of qualified Jewish employees to U.S. posts in Arab-bloc countries.

The resolution which I am introducing today expresses the sense of the Congress that the President should take such steps as may be necessary to assure that the assignment of U.S. employees in the United States and at posts abroad shall be made without regard to race, religion, color, or national origin.

By its demonstrated willingness to go along with the anti-Semitism practiced by these Arab-bloc countries when assigning U.S. personnel abroad, the administration is guilty of following a double standard, properly outlawing discrimination by private employers at home, but improperly discriminating in assigning its own employees abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I would welcome the support of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for this important measure.

#### A TRIBUTE TO THE U.S. COAST GUARD RESERVE ON ITS 25TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, on February 19, 1941, a new Reserve component of our Armed Forces was born, and it is with great pleasure that I take this opportunity to pay trib-

ute to this fine organization, the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve.

From my personal experience and long association with the Coast Guard Reserve, both as a commissioned officer and a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I can state with a great deal of conviction that its members, whatever their individual backgrounds may be, reflect one thing in common—devotion, extreme pride, and an intense feeling of national responsibility.

Prior to the outbreak of World War II, the Coast Guard had no organized reserve, and its entire strength numbered less than 20,000 officers and men. With ever-increasing duties as the approaching war threatened this Nation, the Coast Guard found it necessary to expand as rapidly as possible, and thus the Coast Guard Reserve came into being.

With the outbreak of war in Europe in September 1939, Coast Guard ships, planes, and stations were ordered to carry out extensive patrols to insure that merchant ships in our waters did not violate the neutrality proclaimed by President Roosevelt. The next summer the Coast Guard began its port security operations under the revised Espionage Act of 1917 and the newly enacted Dangerous Cargo Act.

On November 1, 1941, the Coast Guard was ordered to operate as part of the Navy. The next month Pearl Harbor was bombed, and we were in the war. As in World War I, a big part of the Coast Guard's task was antisubmarine warfare. Coast Guard cruising cutters and convoy escorts helped with the battle of the Atlantic as they sank 11 U-boats. At the same time, more than 4,000 survivors of torpedoes and other enemy action were rescued from the Atlantic and Mediterranean by Coast Guardsmen.

But there were losses too. The cutter *Hamilton* went down while in tow after being torpedoed off Iceland. The *Acania* was sunk in the Caribbean; *Escanaba*, *Leopold*, *Muskeget*, and *Natsek* in the Atlantic; *Serpens* in the Pacific. Only two of the crew survived *Escanaba*—no one, on board *Muskeget*, *Serpens*, or *Natsek*. More than 90 percent of those who went down with these vessels were members of the newly established Reserve component of the Coast Guard.

When she was desperately needed for convoy duty in the North Atlantic and was thrown into the breach to help stem the mounting losses to German submarines, the *Escanaba* was based at Grand Haven, Mich. The members of her crew and their families were a valued and highly respected part of that small community. The tragic loss of the *Escanaba* with all but two of her crew was a deep and personal tragedy to that entire region. Today, those men are still mourned in Grand Haven. Each year, memorial exercises are conducted there, in memory of the *Escanaba* and the gallant men who perished when that vessel went down.

Many more reservists manned landing craft that hit the invasion beaches with assault troops at Guadalcanal, Anzio, Tarawa, Attu, north Africa, Salerno, Makin, Kwajalein, Eniwetok, Normandy,

southern France, Luzon, Guam, Saipan, Iwo Jima, Okinawa—the Coast Guard Reserve made all those stops and a lot in between. At the conclusion of the war the Coast Guard had 802 vessels of its own and in addition was manning 351 Navy and 288 Army craft.

Total personnel had reached a peak of approximately 174,000 and of that number more than 150,000 were Coast Guard reservists who had entered the service for wartime duty. Many of that number formed the nucleus for the establishment of our regular peacetime Reserve and are still serving with Reserve components. Others have completed their 20 or more years of satisfactory service and, having reached the age of 60, are now retired under the Reserve Retirement Act.

Through its intensive and well-organized training program the Coast Guard Reserve is today a highly trained and efficient organization which, I am confident, that if called to the defense of this Nation, would prove to be both ready and reliable and once again would serve with honor and distinction. I am extremely proud to be a member of this organization and honor it here on its 25th anniversary.

#### BOYCOTTING SHIPS OF NATIONS SUPPLYING NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the action taken on February 18, 1966, by the Maritime Trades Department of the AFL-CIO in proposing a boycott of ships of nations which permit any of its flag vessels to carry or supply goods to North Vietnam clearly reflects a deep concern about this intolerable situation.

It is indeed tragic that the administration has remained so indifferent that it has become necessary that individual efforts be undertaken to pressure our Government into halting this aid and comfort to our enemy.

The recent administration action prohibiting vessels which engage in trade with the Hanoi regime from carrying U.S. Government financed cargoes, while certainly necessary, is clearly insufficient to bring about an end to free world traffic into the harbor of Haiphong.

If the administration is not sufficiently concerned to stop this trade then it is clearly the responsibility of the Congress to do so. Legislation to close our ports to those helping to supply North Vietnam is now pending before the Congress and should receive our early and favorable consideration.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple issue, and I predict that if the administration continues to abdicate its responsibility of leadership it will continue to be shoved into doing whatever necessary to stop this trade.

#### POSTSCRIPT ON A SOLDIER

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, on October 6 of last year I rose on the floor of this House to express my regret and deep concern over a soldier from the 1st Cavalry Division—Airmobile—who had gone on a self-imposed hunger strike protesting his assignment to Vietnam on the grounds that he disagreed with our policy there. On that day, Mr. Speaker, the world had heard a great deal about this soldier, Pvt. Winstel Belton, and relatively little about the newly formed 1st Air Cavalry. But how things have changed since October 6. Over the past months the world has learned about the 1st Cavalry. Its victories, its bravery, and its sacrifices are well known and are now a matter of record; while the story of Private Belton has been out of the news entirely. But, Mr. Speaker, while he has been out of the news, a great change has come over this soldier. He has distinguished himself in the service of his country, he has won honor on the battlefield, and has earned a promotion to private, first class. Therefore, I think it only fitting that I insert in the RECORD the very gratifying postscript to the story of Winstel Belton, as reported last week in an article from the Atlanta Journal:

SOLDIER WHO WENT ON STRIKE WINS HONOR ON BATTLEFIELD

(By Peter Arnett)

BEN CAT, SOUTH VIETNAM.—Six months ago a university graduate named Winstel R. Belton staged a 7-day hunger strike at Fort Benning, Ga., to dramatize his distaste for being drafted and his refusal to fight in Vietnam.

Thursday a big, proud smile flashed across Belton's face as he was promoted to private, first class, on a battlefield in South Vietnam. Looking just as proud was his company commander, Capt. R. E. Spriggs of Mexico, N.Y., a professional soldier who hated everything Belton's hunger strike had stood for.

Spriggs was furious last November when he returned to his unit after recovering from a bullet wound to find Belton assigned there. Spriggs said Thursday he would take the 26-year-old Winslow, Ariz., soldier into combat with him anytime, anywhere.

Belton arrived in Vietnam with a 12-month suspended jail sentence hanging over his head because of his hunger strike in mid-August. A court-martial had given him a bad conduct discharge, total forfeiture of pay and the jail sentence.

But he was also given a chance.

Belton, a Negro, was told that if he went to Vietnam and proved himself, he would not have to serve his jail sentence. If he failed, he would serve it.

His old unit, the U.S. Army's 1st Cavalry Airmobile Division, wouldn't take him back. The 1st Infantry Division accepted him.

Spriggs was the only man in a company of the 2d Battalion, 28th Regiment, who knew that the new radio-telephone operator was the hunger striker Belton.

Lt. Gus Berzines, a weapons platoon commander from Kalamazoo, Mich., recalled talking with Belton one day about various

things and finally saying, "You mean you're that Belton?"

More and more men in the unit began realizing that Belton had publicly protested what they themselves had accepted as a patriotic duty. None of them brought up the subject with him except the company commander, and few ever discussed it among themselves.

"That was his business," said Sgt. Frederick Range of Dallas, Tex. "We treated him like any other soldier."

Belton, holder of a bachelor of science degree in education, was initially cold and reserved with his buddies. But the heat of battles in December and January melted his attitude and forged ever-tightening bonds with Spriggs and the other men in the company.

Initially given the job of laying wires between the company headquarters and the platoons, he began carrying Spriggs' radio.

Early in January, he proved he had what it takes.

Sp5c. Larry Kabriel of Summerfield, Kans., recalls that the company was under heavy fire near Trung Lap and an urgent call came over the radio for Captain Spriggs.

The radioman shouted back: "The captain's not here. He's up front. There's heavy fire, I can't reach him."

Kabriel said Belton shouted out, "It's your duty to get up to the captain," crawled over to the reluctant radioman, grabbed the apparatus and moved up under fire to his captain.

Spriggs has used him as his radioman ever since.

"Belton in his conduct and bearing has been above average as a soldier and a valuable asset," Sprigg said. "He has worked in very well socially and he has got along with the men.

"I am personally satisfied that he now honestly believes his actions in the past have not been consistent with being a soldier or a man.

"I personally wrote to the commanding general recommending that he be promoted and his sentence remitted. Belton has seen men fight and die for his country, and he has felt the honor that comes when you do fight."

Spriggs tried to promote Belton 2 months ago, but the Army wanted to wait longer. Spriggs was told he must be absolutely sure Belton had changed his ways.

"I told Belton he deserved to be promoted," Spriggs said. I knew he was happy. I knew he felt he had made it."

#### MOUNT VERNON

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, with the celebration of George Washington's birthday, I must call the attention of the Congress to a series of recent editorials emphasizing the imminent danger to the view from Mount Vernon if Congress does not act during this session.

These excellent editorials testify to the efforts of my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, HERVEY MACHEN, to prod the administration and the Congress into fulfilling the commitment made in the early 1960's with the passage of Public Law 87-362, to save the view from Mount Vernon. This law was introduced by Senator CLINTON ANDERSON in the Senate and by the gentleman from Colorado,

Chairman WAYNE ASPINALL, and myself in the House.

With the passage of that law—without a dissenting vote—the Accokeek Foundation under the presidency of our beloved colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio, FRANCES BOLTON, along with the Alice Ferguson Foundation, agreed to donate to the Federal Government, without cost, about half the land needed to protect the view.

Beyond that, over 130 private landowners have, without cost, donated scenic easements to the Department of the Interior to further this effort to save the view from Mount Vernon.

The State of Maryland has passed pioneering tax reform legislation recognizing the public purpose of these donations, and the Prince Georges County has passed the first local scenic space laws in the land, giving tax credits to the donors.

This is the greatest joining together of private, foundation, county, State, and Federal efforts to preserve our heritage for the people of this Nation.

Here is the one shining example of a project where everyone has done his part—except the Federal Government.

Unless the Federal Government acts now—at this session of Congress—this great pilot project will dismally fail. Other States, counties, organizations, and individuals throughout the Nation, who have watched the development of this unique project, may well be discouraged in their efforts.

Fortunately, my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, HERVEY MACHEN, who took office in January 1965, and who represents the area in Maryland opposite Mount Vernon, has placed before us a bill to get the Federal Government moving again. This bill provides for the increases in land prices due to the Government procrastination in purchasing the remaining acreage needed.

We have been constantly reminding the Congress and the executive that further delays and procrastination will be the death knell of this project to which so many have devoted so much. Congressman MACHEN deserves our full support in this campaign to complete this task so well begun.

To lose all that has been accomplished would be a real tragedy. The loss would be not only of the millions of dollars worth of lands and rights in lands being patriotically donated without cost, but also the loss of the pilot project in which Federal funds are outweighed by foundation and private donations, and the protection of natural beauty of a large area is accomplished without increased expense, dislocation of families, and attendant problems.

Congressman MACHEN has thoughtfully said:

If we can show the country how we can carry out an experiment in cooperative and coordinated scenic protection such as this program at Piscataway Park opposite Mount Vernon, we are setting the stage for a great movement across the country.

If the Congress does not act on Congressman MACHEN's bill this session, we will have failed. We cannot wait longer for the Department of the Interior to

make up its mind whether or not to support the President's year-old program to make the Potomac a "model river of scenic and recreation values for the country."

Let us move quickly to do our part, as indicated in these recent editorials:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Dec. 15, 1965]

#### THREAT AT PISCATAWAY

Back in 1961 Congress leaped at a rare opportunity to preserve forever, at moderate Federal cost, more than 1,100 acres of choice shoreline property along the Potomac near Maryland's Piscataway Creek—directly across the river from historic Mount Vernon.

In brief, this remarkable deal provided that the Federal Government need buy only about half the newly authorized Piscataway Park. The remainder, it was understood, would be acquired entirely by private donation. And the 1961 law also authorized the Park Service to seek scenic easements—also free—restricting obtrusive development in a vast area of an additional 2,596 acres contiguous to the park.

Well, the private part of the bargain has progressed with phenomenal success. Thus far, private foundations have actually donated or committed themselves to donate some 499 acres for the park. Scenic easements have been contributed by more than 120 landowners, involving about 900 acres of land. These generous donations are conditioned, however, as might be expected, on the firm understanding that the Government meet its obligation. And the sad fact is that the time when these donations may begin to revert from Federal control is rapidly approaching.

For the Government has not held up its end. Thus far, only 97 acres have been bought—largely because the figure authorized for expenditure by Congress in the 1961 act has proved to be grossly inadequate. Before further funds will be appropriated, the authorization needs to be increased some \$2.5 million. Representative HERVEY MACHEN is leading the sensible legislative fight for the increase, and seems to have met a stone wall.

The latest frustration surprisingly came from the conservation-minded Interior Department itself, which the other day recommended to Congress that the MACHEN bill be "deferred" pending the outcome of "a broad study" of all of Interior's land-acquisition programs. The presumption is that the study will wind up early next year. But there is no assurance of that, and, even if there were, any loss of time at this stage of the Piscataway project constitutes a threat.

It is a needless threat. Instead of his wishy-washy approach, Secretary Udall should be beating the drums for the MACHEN bill. With assurance that the Federal Government intends to carry out its agreement, there is every reason to believe that other donations of land, and many more donations of easements, would materialize. Without that assurance, the public might wind up with the 97 acres the Government now owns and nothing more.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 27, 1965]

#### NOW OR NEVER

The broad stretch of wooded land across the Potomac from Mount Vernon has been marked on the maps for some years as a future Federal park. But unless Congress and the Interior Department act swiftly, the opportunity to preserve that landscape will be lost forever.

The Government now unconditionally owns only 97 acres of more than 1,100 acres envisioned for this future Piscataway Park. Another 151 acres has been donated, but

with the agreement that it reverts to its former owner in August 1967, if the park has not been substantially completed by then. Other owners have committed themselves to donate an additional 345 acres, but with similar qualifications. If the Interior Department does not buy the remaining 520 acres promptly, then, the titles to the donated land will fall out of its hands and the concept of a riverbank park there will evaporate.

The Piscataway Park is becoming a national model of the use of easements to protect parklands in rapidly expanding cities. Some 120 owners have donated development easements covering 888 acres in a broad band around the park itself; but these easements are also conditioned on prompt completion of the park.

It is inexplicable, then, that the Interior Department should be delaying the decision to proceed with this park. It has a clear duty to support warmly and actively Congressman MACHEN's bill to authorize the money for the land that must be purchased. This river shore's importance to the view from Mount Vernon gives it a unique claim upon the attention of the Department and of Congress. It cannot be ignored by an administration that prides itself upon its regard for natural beauty.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,  
Jan. 15, 1966]

**UDALL PROMISES FULL SPEED ON PISCATAWAY PARK—PRAISES PRINCE GEORGES' SCENIC EASEMENT LAW**

(By Maurine Hoffman)

Responding to recent criticism, Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall promised yesterday that the Johnson administration will acquire park land to preserve the view from Mount Vernon of the Potomac River shore.

He made the announcement at Mount Vernon during a ceremonial signing of the Nation's first local law giving tax credit for scenic easements.

The law, passed by the Prince Georges County Board of Commissioners, was praised by Udall as a "new conservation tool of national significance."

Udall assured about 50 persons gathered at the mansion that the "door is now open up to the Hill" for approval of a bill asking funds to purchase land on the Maryland shore of the Potomac.

The hostess for the ceremony was Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, Republican, of Ohio, vice regent of the Mount Vernon Ladies Association, which operates the mansion, and president of the Accokeek Foundation, which has donated land for the proposed park.

Other dignitaries present included MACHEN, Representative CARLTON D. SICKLES, Democrat, of Maryland, and two Prince Georges delegates to the General Assembly, Dr. Arthur Gorman and Ray McDonough, who sponsored State legislation enabling the ordinance.

**INDIFFERENCE CHARGED**

Representative HERVEY G. MACHEN, Democrat, of Maryland, sponsor of the bill, charged this week that the administration has blocked the proposal with a "wall of indifference" in spite of its pledge to make the Potomac "a model of conservation."

The legislation would make possible the proposed 1100-acre Piscataway Park that would include the Maryland shore of the Potomac across from Mount Vernon. About half of the 7½-acre river front opposite the mansion has been donated to the Government by two foundations. In addition, 130 owners of adjacent property have granted 900 acres of scenic easement for the park.

The scenic easements will revert to their owners by 1967 unless the Federal Government buys the remaining land. Legislation to set up the park was originally passed in 1961 but has not been implemented.

The Prince Georges ordinance permits the county to grant a tax credit up to half the total real estate tax levied against property if the owner grants a perpetual scenic easement to Federal, State, or county governments.

The ordinance will attract national attention and "will be noted with interest by those trying to find solutions to conservation problems that seem insolvable," Udall said. He also applauded it on the grounds that it "will save the view from Mount Vernon, the first house in the country."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 17, 1966]

**HOPE FOR PISCATAWAY PARK**

It appears that the efforts to preserve the Potomac shoreline across the river from Mount Vernon are at long last going to succeed. Without explaining the curious inaction of his Department regarding the Piscataway Park project over the past 5 years, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall raised the hopes of preservationists the other day when he announced that Congress will be requested to authorize purchase of the 520 acres needed to complete the project this session.

The Secretary's action comes none too soon. Nearly 500 acres of the proposed 1,100-acre Federal park have been donated or promised by private owners, but the gifts are conditioned on the Government purchasing the remainder of the land by August 1967. Another 900 acres around the park have been pledged as development easements with a similar stipulation.

The years of toll and anguish expended by those who would preserve unmarred the vista from President Washington's home and at the same time create a splendid riverside park for the residents of the National Capital area will be wasted in all probability unless Representative MACHEN's bill is acted upon.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) News American,  
Jan. 23, 1966]

**NOW OR MAYBE NEVER**

Piscataway Park should be of concern and interest to every Marylander, Virginian, and other U.S. citizens.

It is in Maryland's Prince Georges County, but the important thing is that the broad stretch of woodland along the Potomac River, 15 miles south of the Nation's Capital, lies opposite Mount Vernon, the stately home of George Washington, a yearly attraction to 1,332,000 visitors.

For a time this view as George and Martha Washington saw it was threatened with high-rise apartments, television towers, gasoline storage tanks, and even, at one period, a sewage treatment plant.

To prevent this, the Department of the Interior purchased 97 acres of more than 1,100 envisioned for the future Piscataway Park.

Another 151 acres has been donated, but with the agreement that it reverts to its former owner in August 1967, if the park has not been substantially completed by then.

Other owners have committed themselves to donate an additional 345 acres, but with similar qualifications.

In addition, 120 homeowners in a broad belt around the proposed park area have given scenic easements for 888 acres. An easement, for which this park has become a national model, leaves title in the owner's hands but commits him to restrict its use, such as cutting trees.

But all of this effort may be lost—and the park, too—unless the Department of the Interior acts now to acquire the remaining 520 acres.

Representative HERVEY G. MACHEN, Democrat, of Maryland, has introduced a bill to authorize the money for the land purchase.

But the Interior Department has done nothing to endorse the bill, and the reason seems unexplainable.

It appears that a prodding from an administration that has pledged itself to natural beauty and cleaning up the Potomac River would be appropriate at this time.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star,  
Jan. 29, 1966]

**TOP PRIORITY PARKS**

After the most depressing sort of inactivity, the prospects suddenly have brightened perceptibly for two vital Federal park projects along the Potomac in Prince Georges County.

President Johnson's request for \$2.9 million to finish building the George Washington Memorial Parkway from the District line to Fort Washington would meet a goal set by Congress 35 years ago. Even more encouraging, the agreement between Federal, State, and county officials on a new compromise route for the road along the river is by far the best of several possibilities.

The second gain, no less important, involves Secretary Udall's new pledge to put his Department's full weight this year behind Representative MACHEN's bill to expand the Government's authority to buy shorefront land across the Potomac from Mount Vernon for the proposed Piscataway Park.

The Secretary's top priority label for this bill is fully deserved. The land, near Maryland's Piscataway Creek, is to be part of a huge natural park, authorized by Congress 5 years ago as a joint Federal-private venture. The efforts of conservationists already have produced commitments to donate nearly 500 acres of land at no public cost. Private citizens also have promised to grant the Government scenic easements on a much larger acreage. All this is contingent, however, on the Government's purchase of some 520 acres, as it agreed to do in 1961.

While the completion of Piscataway Park will be a notable gain in itself, even larger stakes are involved. For with its use of the techniques of scenic easements and land donations on such a broad scale, the machinery of the Piscataway project could well become a model for future use elsewhere. Its failure, on the other hand, for want of Federal participation, could deal a severe blow to the ambitious conservation plans for the Potomac Basin.

**NATIONAL HOCKEY LEAGUE**

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as most of my colleagues are aware, the National Hockey League recently granted six additional franchises. My own city of Baltimore was an applicant for one of those franchises and, I am advised, had complied with all the league requirements for such a franchise.

Much to everyone's surprise, however, Baltimore was not one of those awarded a franchise. Instead, one of the cities granted a franchise had dropped out of contention and did not even send a representative to the National Hockey League's expansion meeting; another has no arena and will ask the voters of that city to approve the erection of one at a later date. In fact, the whole story as set out in the following article from the

February 11, 1966, edition of the Baltimore News American is a shocking one and merits investigation.

Mr. Speaker, in keeping with that thought I have asked the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to investigate the allegations set forth in the newspaper article. I commend the article to all my colleagues for their reading:

SWAMI SAYS: NHL EXPANSION RETAINED  
THE INBRED LINE  
(By N. F. Clarke)

For many years the National Hockey League has enjoyed, if that is the word, a reputation for being the tightest, most inviolate clique in sports. And that, of course, means anywhere because Washington contains congressional watchdogs who see to it that monopolistic tendencies are discouraged in other lines of business.

Anyone who imagined that the expansion of the NHL now being undertaken represented a breach in the solid front at last now has the events of this week to disillusion him. There still could be aspects of the approval of new franchises that possibly could bear investigation by antitrust authorities.

A Maryland Senator might undertake introduction of the matter in proper places, since Baltimore was turned down on a legitimate bid, while others of less or no validity according to the NHL's own requisites for application were accepted.

The paradox, which badly shocked this town when its representatives were spurned, loses its perplexity in the face of certain interesting facts.

Of what were supposed to be six new franchises open to bidders who could meet requirements as laid down by the NHL, actually one only was at all available to Baltimore, in the light of the final expansion. It went to Philadelphia, a last-minute entry which has not even the first requisite—a place in which to play.

The other five cities accepted turned out to have been foregone conclusions. Los Angeles and San Francisco were absolute musts, an inescapable fact which everyone knew in advance. No national television sponsor could be sold without proper exposure of his message on the west coast, and the only reason the NHL ever considered dilating its cozy little coterie in the first place was to latch onto a share of TV's lush millions.

#### THEY COULDN'T MISS

What was not known in advance, but perhaps should have been if the matter were given study, was that three other locations could have been equally predictable.

St. Louis, Minneapolis-St. Paul and Pittsburgh were not rated among contenders as prime as, for instance, Baltimore, Vancouver, and Buffalo. St. Louis, in fact, dropped out when the original group there reported difficulties and did not even send representatives to the NHL's New York expansion meeting.

But, with no one bidding—which after all is an essential even more basic than a playing arena—the NHL nabobs still saw their way clear to admitting St. Louis to the fold.

Naturally, that was not as miraculous, or as idiotic, as it seems. It happens that James Norris, owner of the Chicago Black Hawks of the NHL, also owns the St. Louis club of the minor central league as well as the rink in which it plays.

Though that arena is rumored about to be condemned to permit expansion of Washington University and there seems a certain reluctance among potential angels about putting up the necessary millions for a ven-

ture that appears so shaky, Norris is said to have assured his colleagues he will have somebody, or somebodies, hooked by the April 5 deadline given him to produce. If he doesn't—well, that time limit can always be extended, according to the way the NHL seems to do business.

#### ST. LOUIS OR BUST

It must be done that way because Norris is supposed to have made his vote for league expansion conditional upon the inclusion of St. Louis. Without being a financial genius, a fellow could guess that a certain amount of profit could be shown on both ends of such a transaction.

Norris is not exactly a stranger to trying things up advantageously in all directions. He had his difficulties once before with the anti-trust bloodhounds, when his International Boxing Club was forced to disband because it was adjudged a constrictive monopoly.

Why was Pittsburgh included in the NHL expansion, when its arena does not even come as close as Baltimore's to suiting the major league's seating specifications and must have considerable reconstruction to comply? Pittsburgh and Philadelphia are both in Pennsylvania and their joint inclusion would not seem to provide TV as comprehensive exposure across the map as it might like.

That's an easy answer, too, it seems. The Pittsburgh franchise in the AHL which must be bought out—though in this case not the city-owned arena—belongs to Bruce Norris. The name is not a coincidence. Bruce is Jim's brother. How clannish can things get?

Last is the case of Minneapolis-St. Paul. These cities have no arena close to NHL specifications and the group which bid in the franchise appears to have no intentions to build one. This need was reported to rest in the capricious laps of Minnesota voters who will be asked later to approve a civic structure.

#### RANGERS WEREN'T HELPING

But as in St. Louis and Pittsburgh, the Twin Cities couldn't miss. The St. Paul minor league team, as it happens, is the property of the owners of the New York Rangers, who by this move also are keeping everything in the family.

The Rangers were reported to be backing the Baltimore bid—but not, as has been shown, until their Minnesota property was taken care of. You can pay no serious attention to statements by Ranger official William Jennings that he urged Clipper officials to get the stage ripped out of the Civic Center. There is no relevancy.

Philadelphia has no building out of which a stage could be ripped. It hasn't in fact, anything but an idea that it can first find the money and then get a \$20 million palace built, all in a year and a half.

It also has as principal owner William Putnam. A source close to the Clippers insists that Putnam has been a business associate of Canadian promoter and sports entrepreneur Jack Kent Cooke. It was Cooke, owner of the NBA Los Angeles Lakers and part owner of the NFL Washington Redskins, who was awarded the Los Angeles franchise in the NHL over four competitors, one of whom was Dan Reeves, the NFL Rams' owner who brought ice hockey to that city as owner of the Western League Blades.

The whole thing at this stage appears to be an untidy, ill-conceived wheels-within-wheels mess. And the inbred tangle might never get off the ground, especially if Washington should cast a critical eye at its seeming ramifications. Baltimore's hopes might not be dead yet.

#### AUTHORIZATION TO INCLUDE VOICE RECORDINGS UNDER FREE AIRMAIL PRIVILEGES FOR SERVICEMEN SHOULD BE ADOPTED

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would authorize the mailing of voice recordings under the free mailing privileges which we extend to our men in service.

Recently, I learned from a newspaper friend of mine, Bill Colvin, editor of the Manhattan, Kans., Mercury, who visited Vietnam at the end of last year and did a series of articles for his paper, that instead of writing letters, many of our men in Vietnam are using tape recorders and sending messages home in their own voices on tape. In turn, they are receiving tapes back in the mail from their families and friends.

Mr. Colvin's observation was substantiated by a USO survey which revealed that voice recordings are the one thing the boys a long way from home really want. The tape centers at the USO's are the most popular spots for off-duty servicemen. There they play the live letters from home and record others to send back.

During the last session, we approved legislation to provide free airmail service for letters, post cards, and postal cards mailed by members of the Armed Forces who are engaged in combat or are hospitalized due to disease or injury suffered in an overseas area. We also made it possible to send parcel post to and from overseas military posts by airmail at reduced rates.

At the time this legislation was passed, it was pointed out that changes should be considered early in the present session so that these same mailing privileges could be extended to our Armed Forces anywhere in the world. Legislation to authorize these extensions as been the subject of hearings by the Postal Operations Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

It is expected that a bill will be reported out in the near future for debate in the House. I would hope that any new legislation which the Congress approves can carry authority to transmit the tapes on the same basis as letters, post cards, and postal cards. It is easy to see why a voice recording would be preferable to an ordinary letter, and how hearing the voice of the serviceman would lift the spirits of the family back home, and how hearing the voices of the wife and children would be a tremendous morale booster for the serviceman in either a hot or cold war situation. It makes good sense, in my judgment, to extend the free mailing privileges to include these voice letters.

### BLUEPRINT FOR THE FUTURE UNITED STATES

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during the past week, I read an article, entitled "Blueprint for the Future United States." Had the article not appeared in the U.S. News & World Report—February 21 issue, page 60—which in my opinion is the most reliable of the news magazines, I would have discounted the projected forecast of things to come as being some kind of fantasy. However, coordinating some of the recommendations which have been made, with the possibilities that can emerge from the recommendations of the do-gooders, the predictions in this article are nothing short of frightening.

Take for instance this one statement:

All past ideas about limits on what a government can do, or what a government can afford, are being junked in the plan for the future.

Already we have seen the accuracy of another statement:

The role of the individual States will dwindle and their power will fade.

Mr. Speaker, I think the U.S. News & World Report has performed a most valuable service in alerting the public to some of the dangers which lie ahead. The question is, Will this Congress face up to its responsibilities in trying to maintain some semblance of common-sense, and fiscal responsibility, in the face of the drive which is now underway to convert this Nation into the most socialistic state that this world has ever known?

When I read that in the America of the future "every citizen is supposed to be guaranteed a minimum income, and a college education if he wants one," I cannot help but wonder what would be the criteria, if any, to be used. Should we require those individuals to put forth any effort, or are we going to abandon the age-old precept that man must live by the sweat of his brow. Do we intend to abandon the idea that ambition is no longer a virtue, and that incentive has no place in our way of life?

More disturbing is the statement, which I know is true; namely, that "the President's Council of Economic Advisers in late January first officially recognized the concept of a negative income tax—a concept that calls for mailing checks from the U.S. Treasury to poor people to assure everybody a guaranteed minimum income," even though the President's special commission recognizes that such a program could cost anywhere from \$2 to \$20 billion a year.

The question naturally arises, "Where is the money coming from?" if everybody is to get a minimum income without working—and Mr. Speaker, I still main-

tain that there are some people who just do not want to work.

But, Mr. Speaker, the most surprising suggestion, and the one which violates every principle of those great liberals who have been pleading against discrimination wherever it exists, is the idea that the President's Council, as a supplement to the negative income tax, proposes special checks to be mailed to Negroes because they are Negroes. And the reasoning behind this? It is supposed to be a part payment for what is referred to as "300 years of systematic denial" of equal opportunity in this country. The article goes on to say that Negro leaders who have suggested this idea which apparently has been embraced by the President's Council in its ever-expanding appeasement policy, have mentioned \$10 billion a year as a reasonable amount.

Because this article is readily accessible to anyone who is interested I am not requesting permission to include the article as a part of my remarks, for certainly if my leftwing friends keep thinking up more ways to spend our hard-earned tax dollars, even if they have to go further in debt, I am going to have to continue to find more ways to save money.

### SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT ON WEATHER MODIFICATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 385)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am transmitting, for the consideration of the Congress, the Seventh Annual Report on Weather Modification (for fiscal year 1965) submitted to me by the Director of the National Science Foundation.

Highly encouraging steps are being taken toward establishing safe and effective programs for modifying the weather. We can now begin to see the day when such programs may become operationally feasible. This is an exciting and encouraging development—not only for Americans, but for men everywhere.

Last year, in transmitting to the Congress the sixth annual report, I indicated the need for a larger effort in basic research and in the development of means to put the knowledge we have to work.

That increased effort is noted in this report. It describes not only the vigorous pursuit of weather modification programs by agencies of the executive branch—but also the valuable stimulus afforded by committees of the Congress,

and the significant activities of nongovernmental groups.

#### RECENT STUDIES

The list of recent activities in this field is heartening. For example, on January 1, 1966, the first Federal regulation on weather modification became effective. The National Science Foundation issued rules providing that advance notice of intention to modify the weather must be given to the Foundation.

More recently, two significant reports by advisory groups have been issued. A two-volume study by a National Academy of Sciences panel, released January 14, reviewed in detail the physical science aspects of weather and climate modification. Five days later the National Science Foundation's Special Commission on Weather Modification issued a broad report covering the biological and social aspects, statistical problems, problems of law and organization, and international implications, as well as physical science aspects. Additional reports by the Special Commission will soon be forthcoming.

Congress, too, has indicated its interest in scheduling additional hearings on weather and climate modification during this session.

It is striking that separate groups dealing seriously with this problem have, after long study, arrived at similar and significant conclusions.

The National Academy of Sciences report, for example, says:

In a sense, weather modification today is a reality. Man can and does interfere with the atmosphere in a number of ways. His ability to produce deliberate beneficial changes is still very limited and uncertain, but it is no longer economically or politically trivial.

The report of the Special Commission, in a markedly similar passage, says:

Weather and climate modification is becoming a reality. The daily activities of man influence the atmosphere in a number of ways and his ability to induce deliberate changes in measurable magnitude by artificial means is progressing.

The report I submit today says it another way:

In 1965, key words are no longer "whether" and "when." They are "what" and "how" and "who."

#### PROBLEMS—AND PROGRESS

Two sets of problems face us and both are difficult. One consists of finding out how to modify the weather and climate. The second consists of determining how best to utilize this knowledge for the benefit of mankind once it is achieved.

The scientists and engineers inside and outside the Government must address themselves particularly to the first set of problems. All of us, as concerned citizens, must seriously consider the second.

At present it appears feasible, under appropriate conditions, to seed some kinds of clouds and achieve increased precipitation. It is also possible, under certain conditions, to dissipate some types of fog. Partial success has been reported from abroad in reducing hail damage.

As our understanding of atmospheric processes increases, our ability to do more will also increase. Even now, men are dreaming and planning of projects that will some day enable us to mitigate the awesome and terrible forces of hurricanes and tornadoes. Such a time is still far off, but perhaps not so far off as we thought only a few years ago.

That so much is being done now is a credit not only to the men of science working in the field, but also to the understanding and support of the Congress which has expressed its interest in and support of this field of great national interest. I commend to your continuing interest this report and the important efforts that it describes.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 18, 1966.

#### CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

#### PROVIDING FOR ADMISSIBILITY IN EVIDENCE OF SLIP LAWS AND THE TREATIES AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ACTS SERIES (TIAS)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12232) to amend title 1 of the United States Code to provide for the admissibility in evidence of the slip laws and the Treaties and Other International Acts series, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman from Colorado could tell me whether this bill will in any way put a restriction upon the multiplicity of executive branch people who are running around the world making commitments which seem to have the validity of treaties. Would this put any restrictions upon these people?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, of course.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. This has nothing to do with treaties or what the State Department or the Senate may confirm or agree with. What it does is make it possible in courts of law to have the so-called Little and Brown editions of laws and treaties declared to be competent legal evidence.

This bill would extend the statutory declaration to include slip laws issued by the Administrator of General Services and TIAS issued by the Secretary of State.

This bill should enhance economy and efficiency by making it unnecessary in the future to certify or authenticate photostatic copies of originals of laws or of treaties. The bill was recommended by the Department of State and has the approval of the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Department of Justice and the Administrator of General Services.

This measure is a clean bill incorporating certain technical amendments made to its predecessor, H.R. 9240.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that I am glad to have the assurance there will perhaps be some economy as a result of this bill. However, I wish the committee could have added something in the bill to circumscribe those people who are slipping around the world committing the Government and the taxpayers of this country to the spending of a lot of money, and committing them perhaps to sending troops over the world.

Mr. Speaker, since this bill does not deal with that, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 12232

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 113 of title 1, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:*

"§ 113. 'Little and Brown's' edition of laws and treaties; slip laws; Treaties and Other International Acts Series; admissibility in evidence.

"The edition of the laws and treaties of the United States, published by Little and Brown, and the publications in slip or pamphlet form of the laws of the United States issued under the authority of the Administrator of General Services, and the Treaties and Other International Acts Series issued under the authority of the Secretary of State shall be competent evidence of the several public and private Acts of Congress, and of the treaties, international agreements other than treaties, and proclamations by the President of such treaties and international agreements other than treaties, as the case may be, therein contained, in all the courts of law and equity and of maritime jurisdiction, and in all the tribunals and public offices of the United States, and of the several States, without any further proof or authentication thereof."

Sec. 2. The analysis of chapter 2 of title 1, United States Code, preceding section 101, is amended by striking out—

"113. 'Little and Brown's' edition of laws and treaties; admissibility in evidence."

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"113. 'Little and Brown's' edition of laws and treaties; slip laws; Treaties and Other International Acts Series; admissibility in evidence."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROHIBITING REFEREES IN BANKRUPTCY FROM ACTING AS TRUSTEES OR RECEIVERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1924) to amend section 39b of the Bankruptcy Act so as to prohibit a part-time referee from acting as trustee or receiver in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if my friend, the gentleman from Colorado, could tell me how we are doing in the matter of bankruptcies in this country these days?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I say, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has access to as many of these reports on the bills as I have. This bill only deals with a limitation to the effect that the judge cannot appoint some referee or part-time referee to a position as a receiver.

Mr. GROSS. Somewhere I believe I read recently that last year we had an all-time record of bankruptcies in this country. That may be a little bit strong—I do not know. It is hard to conceive that in these days when we are supposedly wallowing—according to the gentleman over in the White House—in prosperity that we would be running a record number of bankruptcies.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It is true that this is an administrative bill.

Mr. GROSS. Does it not seem strange to the gentleman from Colorado that we are having all these bankruptcies when we are supposed to be wallowing in prosperity and there are those in high places who say we can afford to spend money for anything and everything under the sun.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That would have nothing to do with this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I see.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1924

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last sentence of paragraph b of section 39 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 67b) is amended to read as follows:*

"Active part-time referees, and referees receiving benefits under paragraph (1) of subdivision d of section 40 of this Act, shall not practice as counsel or attorney or act as trustee or receiver in any proceeding under this Act."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend section 39b of the Bankruptcy Act so as to prohibit referees from acting as trustees or receivers in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act."

With the following committee amendment:

No. 1. Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the second and third sentences of paragraph b of section 39 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 67b) are amended to read as follows: 'Active full-time referees shall not exercise the profession or employment of counsel or attorney, or be engaged in the practice of law; nor act as trustee or receiver in any proceeding under this Act. Active part-time referees, and referees receiving benefits under paragraph (1) of subdivision d of section 40 of this Act, shall not practice as counsel or attorney nor act as trustee or receiver in any proceeding under this Act.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 39b of the Bankruptcy Act so as to prohibit referees from acting as trustees or receivers in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CHARTERING BY ACT OF CONGRESS OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA**

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 552) recognizing the 50th anniversary of the chartering by act of Congress of the Boy Scouts of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman from Colorado, referring to the amendment striking out all the "whereas" clauses in the resolution, whether that is the result of the unanimous action of the House Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I cannot say definitely whether it was or not.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include the report on H. Con. Res. 552.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the programs and activities of the Boy Scouts of America have been of tremendous value to the people of the United States in fostering habits, practices, and attitudes conducive to good character, citizenship, and health in the youth of this Nation.

On June 15, 1916, a Federal charter was conferred on the Boy Scouts of America by act of Congress.

The Boy Scouts of America was the first youth organization to be granted a charter by act of Congress and the Congress has been kept informed of the programs and activities of the Boy Scouts of America through the annual reports made to it each year in accordance with its charter.

In recognition of the outstanding public service performed by this youth organization, I have the great pleasure to sponsor House Concurrent Resolution 552 which pays tribute to the Boy Scouts of America on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of their Federal incorporation.

Mr. Speaker, having been involved in the scouting movement for a long time, I am naturally proud and take pride in the growth of the scouting movement not only in my home district but in our Nation and indeed in the whole free world. I take additional pride, therefore, in urging my colleagues to adopt this resolution.

The Committee on the Judiciary submitted the following report:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 552) recognizing the 50th anniversary of the chartering by act of Congress of the Boy Scouts of America, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendment and recommend that the concurrent resolution do pass.

The amendment is as follows: On pages 1 and 2, strike all "Whereas" clauses.

**STATEMENT**

The programs and activities of the Boy Scouts of America have been of great value

to the people of the United States in fostering habits, practices, and attitudes conducive to good character, citizenship, and health in the youth of this Nation.

On June 15, 1916, a Federal charter was conferred on the Boy Scouts of America by act of Congress (39 Stat. 227; 36 U.S.C. 21).

In recognition of the outstanding public service performed by this youth organization, this concurrent resolution pays tribute to the Boy Scouts of America on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of their Federal incorporation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House concurrent resolution, as follows:

**H. CON. RES. 552**

Whereas June 15, 1966, will mark the fiftieth anniversary of the granting by Act of Congress of the charter of the Boy Scouts of America;

Whereas the Boy Scouts of America was the first youth organization to be granted a charter by Act of Congress;

Whereas the Congress has been kept informed of the programs and activities of the Boy Scouts of America through the annual reports made to it each year by this organization in accordance with such charter.

Whereas these programs and activities have been designed to instill in boys the moral and ethical principles, and the habits, practices, and attitudes, which are conducive to good character, citizenship, and health; and

Whereas, by fostering in the youth of the Nation those qualities upon which our strength as a Nation is dependent, the Boy Scouts of America has made a contribution of inestimable value to the welfare of the entire Nation: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby pay tribute to the Boy Scouts of America on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the granting by Act of Congress of the charter of the Boy Scouts of America, and expresses its recognition of and appreciation for the public service performed by this organization through its contributions to the lives of the Nation's youth.*

The concurrent resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The following committee amendment was agreed to:

On pages 1 and 2, strike all "Whereas" clauses.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 68, which is similar to House Concurrent Resolution 552.

The Clerk called the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 68).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution?

There was no objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

**S. CON. RES. 68**

Whereas June 15, 1966, will mark the fiftieth anniversary of the granting by Act of Congress of the charter of the Boy Scouts of America;

Whereas the Boy Scouts of America was the first youth organization to be granted a charter by Act of Congress;

Whereas the Congress has been kept informed of the programs and activities of the Boy Scouts of America through the annual

reports made to it each year by this organization in accordance with such charter;

Whereas these programs and activities have been designed to instill in boys the moral and ethical principles, and the habits, practices, and attitudes, which are conducive to good character, citizenship, and health; and

Whereas, by fostering in the youth of the Nation those qualities upon which our strength as a Nation is dependent, the Boy Scouts of America has made a contribution of inestimable value to the welfare of the entire Nation: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby pays tribute to the Boy Scouts of America on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the granting by Act of Congress of the charter of the Boy Scouts of America, and expresses its recognition of and appreciation for the public service performed by this organization through its contributions to the lives of the Nation's youth.*

**AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MOORE**

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOORE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 552 as passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the purpose of the gentleman from West Virginia to strike out the preamble?

Mr. MOORE. My amendment would strike out the language of the Senate concurrent resolution and substitute in lieu thereof the language of the concurrent resolution just passed by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia strike out the preamble or all after the enacting clause and substitute the language of the House concurrent resolution just passed?

Mr. MOORE. It would strike out all after the enacting clause.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That would not eliminate the preamble.

Mr. MOORE. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the preamble.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MOORE moves to strike out the preamble.

The amendment was agreed to.

A similar House concurrent resolution was laid on the table.

**GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND**

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks with respect to the action just taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

**LAND IN TRUST FOR MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10431) to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to interrogate the chief handler of this bill.

I notice in these bills, which have to do with the title to Indian lands, there is a thread that seems to go all through them that the land will be used for re-development purposes, and so forth. I also note that title to these lands is being put in trust in the United States. In the event that the Indian tribes want to convey these lands with title in trust to the United States, who would sign the conveyance? Is there a method by which these lands can be conveyed once they are placed in trust in the United States?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Title would have to be transferred then by the Secretary on the authority given by Congress. These are reservation lands. The gentleman is correct in noting that in some instances we have transferred the land in fee to the Indians and then they can alienate the title themselves, but in most of these operations in the small areas, like the three bills on today's Calendar, we did not think it was quite appropriate to place the title in fee so far as the Indians are concerned, because then they would have to assume the responsibilities of paying taxes, and so forth, and in these particular areas they should not assume that responsibility.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as placing title to these lands in the United States will save these tribes from becoming a victim of designing persons, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10431

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That all right, title, and interest of the United States in land heretofore used in connection with the White Earth Indian Boarding School described as the southwest quarter northeast quarter section 23, township 142 north, range 41 west, fifth principal meridian, Becker County, Minnesota, comprising 40 acres, excepting all improvements thereon that are the property of individual tribal members, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LAND FOR THE APACHE TRIBE, MESCALERO RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12264) to declare that 99.84 acres of Government-owned land acquired for Indian administrative purposes is held by the

United States in trust for the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 12264

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of land situated in sections 27 and 28, township 13 south, range 12 east, New Mexico principal meridian, and improvements thereon, formerly used for Indian administrative purposes, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Apache Tribe of Mescalero Reservation, New Mexico, subject to valid existing rights, and subject to the right of the United States to use any of said land and improvements for governmental purposes for the benefit of the Indians. The land is within the Mescalero Reservation and is commonly known as small holding claim numbered 485, United States Land Office serial numbered Las Cruces 07366, containing approximately 99.84 acres. It is identified on supplemental plats of survey of sections 27 and 28, township 13 south, range 12 east, New Mexico principal meridian, New Mexico, accepted April 30, 1936, as "Private Claim 485".

SEC. 2. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 12264 is to transfer the beneficial title to a 99.84 acre tract of land and improvements thereon now owned by the United States to the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Indian Reservation in New Mexico in order to provide the land needed on which to build low-rent housing for these Indians. I have long supported legislation that is intended to expedite the assimilation of the American Indian into the mainstream of our society. Transfer of title for this land to the Mescalero Apache Tribe will be, in my estimation, another step forward in this direction.

The purpose of H.R. 12265 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to declare that the United States holds in trust for the New Mexico pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia certain lands and improvements now owned by the United States if and when they are no longer needed by the Government. The approximate total of acreage involved here is some 435 acres of land previously set aside by the Government for school and administrative use. The total value of the land and improvements thereon is approximately \$31,000. In my considered opinion the aforementioned New Mexico pueblos will be able to make good use of this land by erecting community centers or for agricultural and grazing purposes. Passage of H.R. 12265 will relieve the Federal Government of responsibility for maintaining the buildings on the land and the Indians will assume the responsibility for maintaining both the lands and the buildings. They can then begin a program designed to enhance their economic and social well-being.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, a bill to declare that 99.84 acres of Government-owned land acquired for Indian administrative purposes is held by the United States in trust for the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation.

The Mescalero tribe of Apache Indians is making a strong bid for improved housing for its members. In order to provide needed land on which to build low-rent housing for these Indians, this land should be held in trust by the United States for them. Already existing facilities will thus be protected, such items as water and sewage systems, sewage treatment facilities, and telephone and powerlines. The desperate need for adequate homes is readily apparent when one considers that of the resident population, 97 percent of the homes lack refrigeration, sanitation facilities are inadequate in 95 percent of the homes, the current average four-room home contains 6.5 persons, and 94 percent of all homes are classed as substandard. Using the Office of Economic Opportunity poverty-level standard—family income of \$3,000 or less annually—one finds that 75.8 percent of Mescalero families have incomes below the poverty level.

There is a scarcity of tribal land suitable for contemplated Indian housing. The tribe in the 10-year planning report for the Secretary of the Interior, stated that 156 low-rent housing units were needed. A portion of the tract involved in the present bill is ideally situated for this purpose, but before an agreement can be reached with the Public Housing Administration, title to the land must be in the tribe.

The land of this 99.84 acre tract lies entirely within the bounds of the Mescalero Indian Reservation as set apart by Executive Order 25861 of May 29, 1873. However, it developed that this property had been settled prior to the Executive order by a non-Indian. The rights of the non-Indian were not determined until 1915 by which time buildings and other facilities of the Mescalero Indian school and agency had been constructed on the land. This non-Indian's interest was purchased by the Government for \$10,000 in 1918.

The Government discontinued use of this property about 1953 for agency and school purposes and since that time the area has been used beneficially by the tribe for agriculture on a permit basis.

A parcel of 12.49 acres of the tract is now used by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in connection with a lease made with the tribe for the use of 18.15 acres of tribal land adjoining the land in question, for the Mescalero National Fish Hatchery. The tribe has agreed by resolution to execute a new lease to continue making this tract available to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries if this bill is enacted into law.

In view of the urgent needs of the Mescalero tribe for improvements in its economic and housing conditions I feel that this bill will, if enacted, make possible a long step forward for this tribe.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO GIVE TO THE INDIANS OF THE PUEBLOS OF ACOMA, SANDIA, SANTA ANA, AND ZIA THE BENEFICIAL INTEREST IN CERTAIN FEDERALLY OWNED LANDS**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12265) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the Pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for school or administrative purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, again I would like to interrogate one of the chief handlers of this bill. I notice that this bill is a little different from the others which would give title to Indian lands in that the Secretary of the Interior would at some future time decide when, as, and if he wants to place the title in trust to these tribes.

In other words, other bills that we have passed placed the title in trust in the United States, or, as you said, give title in fee to the Indian. Here is a little different situation where we might be establishing a precedent, in that we are reposing the power to vest title in trust in the Secretary of the Interior. Have you noticed that in this bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I have not noticed any major difference. As far as this legislation is concerned, the transfer is purely an administrative act, and inasmuch as we give to the Secretary this authority to transfer these lands to the Indians themselves, in trust, then the Secretary will do it as soon as he understands that the Indians are ready to go ahead and take over the administration of this additional area.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Then the gentleman feels that the Secretary of the Interior can repose a trust in lands over and above the right of Congress?

Mr. ASPINALL. No. As I understand it, in this respect this is an action of Congress which places these lands in the ownership of the Indians in trust. The trust—estate—is still the same in this instance as in the other. The presence of mineral rights may make a minor difference. It is a question of procedure, if I understand what my friend is talking about.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman is right, and I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 1904, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1904

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That when the following identified lands (other than the mineral interests specifically excluded in the identification), which were set aside for school or administrative purposes, are no longer needed by the United States for the administration of Indian Affairs, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to declare, by publication of a notice in the Federal Register, that the title of the United States to such lands and improvements shall thereafter be held in trust for the Indians of the Pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia as follows:

(1) Acoma day school site comprising three and five-tenths acres, more or less, to the Indians of the Pueblo of Acoma;

(2) Sandia school site comprising sixty-three one-hundredths of an acre, more or less, to the Indians of the Pueblo of Sandia;

(3) Santa Ana school site comprising two and eighty-one one-hundredths acres, more or less, excluding mineral interests therein, located within the El Ranchito grant, to the Indians of the Pueblo of Santa Ana; and

(4) Administrative site in the Borrego grant, comprising four hundred and twenty-eight acres, more or less, excluding minerals therein, to the Indians of the Pueblo of Zia.

Sec. 2. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of lands and improvements placed in a trust status under the authority of this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the Pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for schools or administrative purposes.

The purpose of H.R. 12265 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give in trust to the pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia in New Mexico the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands and improvements when they are no longer needed. The lands total 435 acres and were set aside for school or administrative use. The value of the lands and their improvements is approximately \$31,000.

Each one of the four pueblos has its own distinctive needs for economic betterment which, through the acquisition of these lands, will be met in part, at least, through present planning of the pueblos themselves. The first to be considered is the Acoma Pueblo.

The Acoma day school site comprises a tract of 3.5 acres located within the Acoma Pueblo grant. It was acquired by the Federal Government through condemnation proceedings in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Mexico

in 1920 at a cost of \$350 for the construction of a school building. The tract, however, was never used for school purposes, and a revocable permit was given to the pueblo of Acoma, which authorized the pueblo to use the tract for agricultural purposes. The present value of the land is \$560.

As the development of agricultural resources and irrigable land is part of the Acoma Pueblo present plans of economic betterment the acquisition of this site will be beneficial to the pueblo—population 1,674 in 1962. The location of the tract is shown on the accompanying map. The total acreage of tribal land is 245,801 and there are 370 acres of allotted land but most of this is nonagricultural grazing land.

Turning now to the Sandia Pueblo we have a day school site comprising 0.63 acre, more or less, which was acquired by the United States in 1930 at a cost of \$126 through condemnation proceedings. The tract was acquired as a site on which to erect Government buildings for the use and training of the Indians attending the day school at the Sandia Pueblo. On July 1, 1960, the operation of an Indian day school at this pueblo was discontinued and the Sandia children now attend public school.

The present estimated value of this tract at Sandia Pueblo, including improvements, is estimated at \$14,227. The improvements consist of one school building and teacher's quarters, pump-house, storage building, warehouse, building for bathhouse, garage, dispensary, plus sewer and water system.

Under a revocable permit the Sandia Pueblo Indians use the buildings on this site as a meeting place for the tribal council and for other community gatherings as the need arises. A portion of the school site is used for a health clinic and as a school for U.S. Public Health Indian sanitarian aids. No conveyance of land or buildings used for health purposes will be made to the tribe without the approval of the U.S. Public Health Service.

The Sandia Pueblo has a small population of 124 people and presently plans to develop a community center providing facilities for library study and youth recreation by securing necessary funds through the Community Facilities Act or other appropriations at an estimated cost of \$75,000. The area in question would be well adapted to serve the purpose of a Sandia Pueblo Community Center.

The third pueblo is Santa Ana and a parcel of 2.81 acres was acquired by the United States in 1920 at a cost of \$140.50 through condemnation proceedings. The purpose of its acquisition was to provide a site for the construction of a school for Santa Ana Pueblo.

Since July 1, 1960, when the Santa Ana Day School was discontinued, the Indian children have been attending public school.

The present estimated value of this land, with improvements is \$13,747 and the improvements consist of a school and quarters building, storage building, bath and storage building, a pumphouse, a water and sewer system.

Under a revocable permit covering the use of all buildings and facilities at the site issued on August 28, 1960, the pueblo Santa Ana plans to use the school site as a meeting place for the tribal council and for community gatherings as the need arises. A portion of the site is being used by the U.S. Public Health Service as a location for an Indian clinic and no conveyance of land or clinic buildings will be made to the tribe without the approval of the U.S. Public Health Service.

The United States holds title to the minerals of the El Ranchito grant and since this site is part of the grant it is not proposed to convey mineral rights of the said parcel to the tribe.

Santa Ana Pueblo has a relatively small population of 366 and badly needs a community center of its own with adequate sanitary facilities under present planning programs. This need would be served by the pueblo acquisition of this site.

The fourth and last pueblo is that of Zia which has an administrative site of 428 acres more or less within the Borrego grant, which was purchased by the United States in the submarginal land purchase project. There is a bit of legislative and administrative history involved in the case of the Borrego grant.

Jurisdiction of the Borrego grant was transferred to the Department of the Interior from the Department of Agriculture by Executive Order No. 7792, dated January 18, 1938. Then some 11 years later the act of August 13, 1949 (63 Stat. 604), all of the Borrego grant, excluding minerals and excepting this administrative site of 428 acres became trust land of the Zia Pueblo. Since the entire Borrego grant was originally purchased by the Federal Government for \$68,239.40, or at an average per acre cost of \$3, this would make the cost of the administrative site \$1,284.

There are no improvements on the administrative site. The Borrego grant is used by the pueblo of Zia for livestock grazing purposes and the administrative site would likewise be used for livestock grazing. The present estimate fair market value of this administrative site is \$2,568 and the site is not currently being used by the Government nor does it have any plans for its future use. The interior of the Borrego grant which includes an administrative site does not have a sectional survey hence no present description is possible. The United States holds title to the minerals in the remainder of the Borrego grant and it is proposed to retain the minerals in the administrative site.

Plans to develop the economy of Zia Pueblo would be expedited by the acquisition of the administrative site by the Indians.

In summary, all of the lands relating to the four pueblos involved in this bill, are in excess of the needs of the Department of the Interior and it is considered that the pueblos involved can make effective use of these lands for community centers or for agricultural and grazing purposes. Through this transfer the Government will be relieved of further responsibility for maintaining the build-

ings no longer needed and the Indians will receive trust title and assume responsibility for lands and buildings which can be used to their own economic and social advantage.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 12265) was laid on the table.

#### WINNING THE PEACE

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Deseret News of Salt Lake City puts it quite plainly when it says:

As we go about winning the war in Vietnam, let's make sure we lay the groundwork for winning the peace, too.

It hails the President's pledge to help achieve political and economic reforms in South Vietnam, stating that "the more that is done to give the people of South Vietnam a greater voice in their government, the more incentive they will have to make the sacrifices necessary to win the war."

Speaking of the woes which the people there are suffering, the paper says:

Simple common sense dictates that everything possible be done to alleviate such suffering, not only for humanitarian reasons but also to expedite the war effort.

We all know that we are now facing conflict on two fronts, and because this article sheds light on the subject I am offering it to the RECORD, where others may want to read it.

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Deseret News, Feb. 10, 1966]

#### WIN THE PEACE, TOO

Since an end to the war in Vietnam seems to be nowhere near in sight, President Johnson's pledge to help achieve political and economic reforms in South Vietnam might seem premature.

On the contrary, the more that is done to give the people of South Vietnam a greater voice in their government, the more incentive they will have to make the sacrifices necessary to win the war.

One of the major problems in South Vietnam has been the rapid turnover in the governments at Saigon. While the more democratic constitution and the elections that have been promised are no automatic guarantee of stability, particularly in a country with virtually no experience with democracy, they at least represent a chance for improvement.

Then there is the drag on the war effort that is being exerted by the 1 million refugees in South Vietnam and by the inflation for which America's presence is at least partly responsible. Simple commonsense dictates that everything possible be done to alleviate such suffering, not only for humanitarian reasons but also to expedite the war effort.

Moreover, once the war is over, peace with freedom will be insecure as long as people are hungry, homeless, and jobless.

As a case in point, remember how tired, disillusioned, and skeptical we all were after

World War II, particularly the people of war-ravaged Europe? Remember how close an economically as well as spiritually sick Western Europe came to succumbing to communism?

What saved the day was, of course, the Marshall plan. It got the recipients on their feet psychologically as well as economically, and won the U.S. allies and markets we might otherwise have lost.

The situations in South Vietnam and in postwar Europe are not, of course, parallel. Europe was already highly industrialized; Vietnam is not. Europe had plenty of highly skilled workers and businessmen; Vietnam does not.

But after a decade or more of war, South Vietnam is sapped and in need of help as Europe was after 4 years. Moreover, if we were to wash our hands of Vietnam after having won victory on the battlefield or at the conference table, it might not be long before war flared up again there just as it did after the Geneva Conference supposedly settled things in 1954.

Nor is there any good reason the United States should be expected to shoulder the burden alone. Even those who oppose what we are currently doing in Vietnam cannot reasonably object to making sure it does not long persist as a potential tinderbox for world conflict.

As we go about winning the war in Vietnam, let's make sure we lay the groundwork for winning the peace, too.

#### FOR BETTER LIFE

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Honolulu Declaration, the Salt Lake Tribune points out, stressed "a resolve to win the war against the Vietcong through both counterinsurgency tactics and civic reform programs.

"Experts have long contended that the only way to defeat the Communist insurgency is to attack the social, economic, and political defects which helped create the insurgency, while the military struggle against the guerrillas continues."

The paper believes that "from a long-range standpoint a U.S.-backed program to improve Vietnam's agriculture and education is of paramount importance."

As I read the editorial I thought: here is a summary of the task which lies ahead, and in the belief that others might find the article illuminating I request that it be made available in the RECORD.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Feb. 10, 1966]

#### BETTER LIFE PLUS VICTORY?

The greatest immediate achievement of the Honolulu talks of President Johnson with Prime Minister Nguyen Cao Ky and others of South Vietnam may stem from the first face-to-face confrontation of chiefs of state of the two countries.

In practical terms, the greatest longer term direct benefit may be action to curb ruinous inflation which is sweeping the war-torn little country. The communique at the close of the meeting pledged "further concrete steps" in this direction. These might include new efforts to keep U.S. military construction from creating pressures on the

supply of Vietnamese labor and commodities and reexamination of the monetary exchange rate for American military personnel.

The "declaration of Honolulu" stressed a resolve to win the war against the Vietcong through both counterinsurgency tactics and civic reform programs. Experts have long contended that the only way to defeat the Communist insurgency is to attack the social, economic, and political defects which helped create the insurgency, even while the military struggle against the guerrillas continues. It is surprising that it has taken so long to give real meaning to this part of the program.

From a long-range standpoint a U.S.-backed program to improve Vietnam's agriculture and education is of paramount importance. Agriculture Secretary Freeman is taking 20 specialists to Vietnam to look at the Mekong Delta area, one of the great rice bowls of southeast Asia. Freeman is one of several high-level officials accompanying Vice President HUMPHREY to southeast Asia. The purpose of the Humphrey trip is believed mainly—psychological—"to continue the momentum" of the Honolulu talks.

If communications between Washington and Saigon are improved and social and political improvement are given real meaning and impetus, then the spectacular conference at Hawaii will prove useful. This is, after all, the first time that a South Vietnamese government has definitely promised to create a better life for its people.

#### IMPORTANCE OF THE OFFICE OF VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the office of the Vice President has been increasing steadily over the past several years. At the present time, the United States does not own or maintain a permanent residence for the Vice President. Such a residence is badly needed. The Vice President is called upon to entertain diplomats, various officials from this country and abroad very frequently.

Accordingly, I have introduced today, a bill authorizing the General Services Administration to plan, design, and construct an official residence for the Vice President of the United States on a 10-acre site at the U.S. Naval Observatory on Massachusetts Avenue NW. We propose a three-story brick and stone structure, three-car garage, grounds to be properly landscaped and fenced. The bill calls for a maximum of \$750,000, including the furnishings.

The Senate passed a bill last year providing for an authorization of \$1 million.

Public hearings have been scheduled for 10 a.m., on Thursday, February 24 in the Full Public Works Committee Hearing Room 2167, the Rayburn Building.

Congressman GEORGE FALLON, Full Committee Chairman on Public Works and I, invite all interested colleagues or their constituents to appear before the committee or submit a written statement concerning this important matter.

We also welcome cosponsorship of the bill.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO THE GAMBIA ON ITS INDEPENDENCE DAY ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, The Gambia, which achieved independence on February 18, 1965, as a constitutional monarchy within the British Commonwealth, has just completed its first year of independence.

My warmest congratulations are extended to Prime Minister Dawda Kairaba Jawara and the people of this young but important member of the family of African independent nations.

The estimated 325,000 population of The Gambia live on a stretch of land, from 7 to 20 miles wide, that extends from the west coast of Africa to a point 200 miles inland. The country's economy is almost entirely agricultural, with peanuts normally comprising about 95 percent of the total value of annual exports.

This young African nation became a member of the Organization of African Unity in March 1965 and was admitted to the United Nations as that organization's 115th member in September of the same year.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere wish, as The Gambia enters upon its second year of independence, that the friendly ties existing between the United States and this young African nation will be expanded and strengthened.

#### LINCOLN, OF SPRINGFIELD

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, the 157th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, the Governor of Pennsylvania, the Honorable William W. Scranton, spoke at a dinner in Springfield, Ill., sponsored by the Abraham Lincoln Association.

It was my privilege to hear this excellent address. I was struck by the parallel drawn by the speaker between present-day national circumstances and those that prevailed during the period when Lincoln was a citizen of Springfield. In my view, the speech points the way of opportunity for the Republican Party, and for our country.

Here is the text:

I do not possess profound scholarly knowledge of the life of Abraham Lincoln, but, as apparently with you, the example of his life among all Americans has always held first place for me. In one critical moment of my own life, I found myself asking, "What would Lincoln have done?" And Lincoln's answer led me to the right decision.

Lincoln's life is probably more familiar to the average person than that of any other American—more familiar even than those of Washington or Jefferson.

We know of him as a young man in the small village of New Salem. The tales of the early life of Abe Lincoln, the railsplitter, still inspire and entertain each succeeding generation of Americans.

And we know him of course for his unmatched accomplishments in the Presidency from 1861 to 1865—the Saviour of the Union, the Great Emancipator, the first successful national leader and virtual founder of the Republican Party.

But it is about neither of these Lincolns that I will talk tonight—neither the New Salem Lincoln, the struggling and humorous youth; nor the Civil War Lincoln, the leader who "belongs to the ages."

Rather it is about the Lincoln who dwelt in this very city of Springfield from the time that he began a law practice in 1837 until he left for Washington in February of 1861—a period of almost 25 years.

These were the prime years of Lincoln's own life. During this time he married, raised children, bought a home, entered politics as a Whig—formed the views and confirmed the character to which he later was to give such magnificent expression.

They are the least well-known years of Lincoln's career. Nevertheless, they should have particular interest and significance for us today.

It was in many ways a time very like our own.

During most of this period, the Nation was governed by a Democratic combination bent on achieving consensus that offered something to everybody—something to farmers, something to bankers, something to southern slaveowners, something to northern factory hands—and something, of course, to the politicians themselves. The minority party, the Whigs, were chiefly negative in outlook and captured the Presidency only when led by a military hero. An extremist group broke and for a time seemed about to take over the minority party. Discrimination was debated as a great national issue. The country became involved in an international war which was severely criticized by many of the leading intellectuals of the day. And while all this was happening, unprecedented economic growth and expansion were taking place.

All of these factors find echoes in our own time.

At first glance, there does seem to be one major difference between the two periods. During the era that culminated in the Civil War, the great moral issue of slavery infected and colored and finally overwhelmed every other subject of political debate. Look where you will at the issues of the time—national expansion, monetary policy, States rights, the tariff, even construction of a transcontinental railroad. In the end each of them comes down to one question: What effect will it have on slavery?

Slavery was indeed the irrepressible issue. Beside it, all other questions sank into at least momentary inconsequence.

There is nothing quite like it today. And yet there is a moral issue that today confronts every one of us and pervades the entire political and intellectual firmament.

That is the question of peace or war. We can no longer define war simply as a more forceful extension of diplomacy. Either war is going to cease or the human race will.

It is the issue that comes back to us, either in a whisper or a roar, from every discussion of politics or economics or culture or indeed existence itself.

So even in this respect our own time is not so very different from those critical decades of the forties and the fifties in which Abraham Lincoln passed most of his mature years.

Consider some of the problems of political principle and national morality with which Lincoln dealt in those years.

This is of interest for what they tell us of Lincoln, the man. Of interest, too, for what they tell us of ourselves, and of the problems that now confront us.

There was first of all the issue of the Mexican War.

President Polk and his administration defended the invasion of Mexican territory, on the ground of national interest—then known as manifest destiny. Our presence in Mexico, they claimed, was dictated by our national interest. To leave would be to imperil our strategic position in the Western Hemisphere.

Most of the intellectuals of the day left little doubt as to what they thought of that argument. Henry David Thoreau, in his customary outspoken way, declared, "The people must cease to make war on Mexico, though it cost them their existence as a people." If Thoreau had been living today, he probably would have burned his draft card. As it was, he simply refused to pay taxes.

Lincoln did not support this position. As a Whig Member of Congress, he questioned the wisdom and even the constitutionality of the war. But once it had begun, he supported its vigorous prosecution.

He did not, however, believe that the minority party in time of war should abdicate its responsibility to criticize.

Again and again, he questioned the assumptions on which the war was being carried on. He rejected the doctrine of national interest, at least in its simple form.

He insisted that the Nation's aims be defined in moral as well as in military terms.

During his own Presidency, Lincoln said it was not so important that God be on our side, as that we be on God's side. This conviction found its roots in his observation of the confused maneuvering of the Polk administration during the Mexican War.

Second, there was the issue of extremism on Lincoln's own side of the political spectrum.

The Whig Party never really got off the ground as an instrument of government in the United States. Although it elected two Presidents, it never captured the imagination of the American people and was unable to achieve a record of stable continuity in office.

By the 1850's, it was evident that something new was needed. The people were crying out for change, and the Whigs were unable to offer attractive or exciting change. For a few years, it seemed that know-nothingism might provide the answer.

The know-nothings were formed as a response to the growing tide of immigration from non-Anglo-Saxon countries to the United States. They had a very simple creed: If you are not like us in race and religion and national origin, we don't want you here.

They fed on fear—the fear of those who had achieved some measure of security toward those who were still struggling upward from the bottom of the ladder. They offered deceptively simple and brutal solutions to difficult social and economic problems.

They were, as we would now say, extremists.

Know-nothingism was a particularly difficult problem for Lincoln. He found many of his closest friends and political allies in the know-nothing movement. When he ran for the State legislature in 1854, he was offered the know-nothing endorsement. At first he hesitated to make his views known.

But he could not hesitate long. He was, after all, Lincoln.

The know-nothing party, he said, was "wrong in principle."

He wrote to his friend, Josh Speed:

"I am not a know-nothing; that is certain. How could I be? How can anyone who abhors the oppression of Negroes be in favor of degrading classes of white people? \* \* \* When it comes to this, I shall prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretense of loving liberty—to Russia, for instance, where despotism can be taken pure, and without the base alloy of hypocrisy."

Lincoln dealt forthrightly with extremism. He said that it had no legitimate connection with true conservatism. He warned that conservatives who lent it a sympathetic ear would do ultimate damage to their cause.

Lincoln was proven right. Within a few years, the fever of know-nothingism had passed. If it had not been stubbornly opposed by men like Lincoln, the birth of the new Republican Party might have been long delayed or might never have taken place. Slavery would have dug itself ever more deeply into the national fabric. Conservatism would have been discredited, and would have been unable to play its necessary role in the development of our country.

The final great national problem with which Lincoln had to deal during his Springfield years was the formation of a new political combination to take the place of the Democrats as the governing party.

The Democratic Party was wrecked by the issue of slavery. Constructed on the twin pillars of patronage and compromise, it failed to evade the moral issue.

Slavery would have to go, or the Nation would be torn asunder. The Democrats were unable to accept either alternative, and therefore collapsed.

The question remained: Who would take their place?

During the long period of Democratic supremacy, the minority party had two great leaders: Daniel Webster, of Massachusetts, and Henry Clay, of Kentucky.

Both had an overpowering itch to become President, but neither ever made it. Both made many valuable contributions to our national development, but neither provided a satisfactory response to the fundamental moral issue of the time.

These two great leaders held different views on how the minority party should be converted into a stable governing combination.

Webster believed that his party should adhere to the business interest, and that it would eventually come to power as surely as day follows night. He is reputed to have said: "Let Congress take care of the rich, and the rich will take care of the poor."

The United States, he reasoned, was inevitably becoming a business civilization, and the party of business was sure to be the governing party within a very short time.

Henry Clay did not share his colleague's certainty on this point. Clay believed in the art of political maneuver.

"All legislation, all government, all society," he declared, "are founded upon the principle of mutual concession." In short: If you want to get along, go along.

Lincoln, although he admired both of the old Whig leaders, particularly Clay, in the end could agree with neither.

To Webster's contention that the conservative party should rest its cause on the business interest, Lincoln replied, "Republicans are for both the man and the dollar, but in case of conflict the man before the dollar."

Clay's argument he found more compelling. Henry Clay had been Lincoln's particular hero since the time of his first entrance into politics. Lincoln himself had spent his share of time in the political back rooms, and he knew that a man who is unwilling at the proper time to compromise is unable to govern.

But Lincoln did not believe that compromise alone could be made the basis for a political party.

In 1859, Lincoln said, "If we shall adopt a platform that fails to recognize or express

our purpose \* \* \* we not only take nothing by our success, but we tacitly admit that we act upon no other principle than a desire to have 'the loaves and fishes.'"

Lincoln knew that no successful political leader can afford to neglect "the loaves and fishes." In a democracy, they supply the indispensable motivation to command the loyalty of the party shock troops on election day. At the same time he knew that a party that relies on tangible rewards alone may win an election or two, but it will never win a generation.

With Emerson, Lincoln saw that the conservative party of his time "contained the best men." But with Emerson, too, he realized that the conservative party could never become the governing party so long as it was merely defensive, merely negative, untransformed by any overriding spirit of idealism.

It was just this act of transformation which Lincoln achieved within the new Republican Party.

For the first time since the days of the Founding Fathers, it was the conservative party that looked confidently toward the future. It was the conservative party that spoke up for the rights of man. It was the conservative party that offered land to the dispossessed, liberty to those who were in chains, and the prospect of economic fulfillment to all.

The result of course is history. A new political party came to power and for the next 70 years remained the principal instrument of government in the United States.

It is entirely in the spirit of Lincoln that I conclude tonight with the suggestion that once again our country is in need of such an act of transformation.

The party that Lincoln helped to create is, now as then, the only available substitute for the current majority party.

I cannot, in all candor, tell you that an act of transformation has as yet taken place within the Republican Party.

But I believe that it will.

It will because it must.

The problems are too grave—the issues too serious—the prospect too glorious—for merely partisan maneuvering in 1966.

The minority will become the majority when it has seized the spirit of idealism that is latent within our people—when it has divested itself of any association with extremism—when it was offered real solutions to the real problems of our country.

I am a Republican—and I believe that is going to happen.

But more than that I am an American—and I believe that it has got to happen.

And if it does not, we will not have America.

#### WHO WILL HE SACRIFICE?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, the recent administration announcement that \$190.6 million would be cut from the aid to schools in federally impacted areas is a severe blow to education. The President tells us in one breath that he will spread our high standards of education to the world by the new worldwide war on poverty. Then with the next breath he says that he will cut a vitally important educational program here at home in half.

There was concern expressed for educational excellence in the state of the Union message, and grand new programs promised. But actions speak louder than all the speeches and the ringing phrases. I recall one phrase vividly—the President asked of those of us who believe in fiscal responsibility “Who will they sacrifice?”

I think it has become very clear who the President will sacrifice. He is asking us to sacrifice the schoolchildren who seek a good education to prepare them for a complex world. He is asking us to sacrifice education standards of the many towns and counties of this Nation where Federal installations have brought in a great influx of workers and their families. These people work, and often live on tax-exempt land, for which the local government receives none of the taxes that other citizens must pay.

The Federal Government has a clear and well-established responsibility here for they are the cause of both the increase in schoolchildren and the loss of tax sources.

Two of the counties I represent in Florida are good examples of the problem. Under the present entitlements of Public Law 874, Brevard County would receive \$2,524,706 in aid. If the administration's plan is accepted they will receive less than half that, \$1,111,011. In other words they will have \$1,413,695 less than they were promised.

Orange County was to have received \$834,520. Under this new slash they will get only \$136,205—a loss of \$698,315. That is less than one-sixth of the amount they were promised.

Brevard County with its constant influx of Federal families and their children has a difficult enough job trying to determine in advance how much money it will need for its next term. Now it cannot even depend on how much it can get.

I ask you, How can local school boards operate and function under this sort of Federal handicap? They have to make plans and budgets in advance. After investing in the beginnings of a new building program, they suddenly learn that several hundred thousand dollars they had been promised from the Government will not be coming in.

Let me quote from two letters I have received just this week from Florida school administrators, telling of the extreme hardships that this unexpected reversal of Federal policy will bring.

One states:

During the past 15 years, the smaller counties of the State have had considerable impact of federally connected children and have also suffered a reduction in the local tax base due to the acquisition of property by the Federal Government. In many instances the moneys provided by Public Law 874 have meant the difference between an adequate school program for all the pupils in these systems and a program which would not meet our standards.

To reduce the moneys in these counties would result in such a forced curtailment of educational advantages now offered that the accreditation of schools, loss of personnel, and general loss of moral would result in an educational crisis from which recovery would be next to impossible.

The other reads:

I believe that failure to receive this expected amount would mean that our receipts would not equal our expenditures, and we would have a deficit for this school year because of the Federal Government's failure to meet its commitment.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an idle give-away program. It is a responsibility of the Federal Government to assist those localities which are hard pressed to educate the tremendous number of students brought suddenly into the area by a Government installation. There are 1,000 school districts in the United States that will suffer from this cut.

Impact aid to education was sound when it began many years ago. It was sound when it was continued year after year by Congress after Congress. Why, at a time when the Federal Government is committing itself, more than in any period of history, in interest and dollars to education, is President Johnson saying this vital program has become unsound and unnecessary?

Why is the President saying, despite all his supposed concern for the quality of education that a long-recognized responsibility of the Federal Government is no longer a responsibility—or at least that it will no longer be treated as one?

Mr. Speaker, I am shocked that the President would propose the sacrifice of the education of our children in order to help finance his expanded spending programs of the Great Society. I urge the Congress to reject this budget-juggling at the expense of schoolchildren to his something-for-everybody budget plans.

#### MIZE PROPOSED TO EXTEND SIGNUP DEADLINE FOR HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM UNDER MEDICARE UNTIL SEPTEMBER 30, 1966

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, as the March 31 deadline for signing up for the voluntary health insurance program under medicare draws closer, it is evident that there is still a great deal of misunderstanding about this particular program. It is a matter of record that millions of older citizens who are eligible for the program have not signed up to participate. In order to get these millions signed, a last-minute drive has been organized by the Office of Economic Opportunity. It is known as Medicare Alert and apparently teams of OEO workers will go from family to family to explain the program and get the names on the dotted lines.

Because of the confusion and misunderstanding, I believe that many of these older citizens should have more time in which to decide whether or not they want to participate. I am suggesting that the deadline be extended until September 30. This will give those who

are considering the value of the program an additional 6 months to consider all of the factors involved before making the decision. Three of the months will be after the program goes into effect on July 1. During these 3 months they will be able to study the program in actual operation and will be in a better position to judge its merits and to determine whether it is needed in order to provide the necessary coverage for them.

Accordingly, I have introduced legislation which will authorize the extension of the deadline until September 30 for all of those who were 65 on January 1 this year and eligible to start receiving coverage under the program on July 1. If any senior citizen has already signed up and is not certain about the program, he would be permitted to delay making the decision until September 30.

Six months appears to be the appropriate period of time for the extension. Under the terms of the program as it is now set up, those who become 65 after January 1 this year actually have a 7-month period in which they can sign up—3 months before the month of their birthday and 3 months after their birthday. During this initial enrolling period, the additional time would be of value not only to the undecided enrollees, but to the officials operating the program as well.

Because time is short, I am urging that immediate hearings be held on this legislation so that the extension can be approved before the March 31 deadline. I am confident that we will be performing a valuable service at this moment of indecision in the minds of a great many of our deserving senior citizens who need assistance but hesitate to obligate themselves for this additional charge if they already have similar coverage or do not have all the facts about the program.

I would hope that many of my colleagues would join in this effort to get an extension of the deadline.

#### PROFITS AND FREEDOM

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on January 25 Mr. Ben H. Wooten, chairman of the board of the Dallas Federal Savings and Loan Association addressed the East Texas Chapter of the Texas Manufacturers Association at Longview, Tex., relative to the lack of establishing priorities on the part of the Federal Government.

This address develops some excellent ideas by a very knowledgeable person as to Government services. Mr. Wooten has served as president and chairman of the board of the First National Bank of Dallas and formerly was president of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Little Rock, Ark. As a result of his experiences he can speak with authority on Government operations.

The address follows:

**PROFITS AND FREEDOM**

(By Ben H. Wooten, chairman of the board, Dallas Federal Savings and Loan Association)

I trust more of our people will appreciate the fact that manufacturing is a major business lifestream of America. Appreciation is a wonderful word, a powerful word; yet, often, a neglected word. If one knows he is appreciated by his family, his friends, his associates, and his neighbors, he can ward off any blow life has to offer, and one of the major purposes of my visit with you this evening is to express to you my abiding gratitude for the development you have brought about and will continue to bring about in this area.

Each of your companies is a corporate citizen entitled to the same privileges, treatment, and protection from the Government as accorded any other type citizen or organization—no more, no less. I am thoroughly convinced that the principle of equal consideration under law of all citizens, personal and corporate, is a must if our economic freedom is to survive. Any type of equitable price control must take into consideration all the component costs that are incurred in the manufacturing of a product.

I, of course, do not know the detailed operations of your various industries but I feel safe in saying that you have left nothing undone to be fair to your employees, just to your customers and liberal with your community and church. It is fine to give fringe benefits as well as good wages but we all, of course, must insist that employees work. Work opens the door to opportunity and work is the creator of wealth.

Longfellow said:

"The heights by great men reached and kept,  
Were not attained by sudden flight,  
But they, while their companions slept,  
Were toiling upward in the night."

The successful manufacturing executive of today in his youth did not watch the clock.

Your economic importance to every community is exceedingly great. The wages you pay make possible the sales of suits of clothes, dresses, automobiles, food, and other necessities of life. The purchase of raw products by your industries enables tremendous employment extending into the rural areas, thus underpinning local economy.

We cannot estimate precisely just what would happen if and when the Vietnam war should close, but regardless of this, we have every reason to believe this will be a very fine year for business. I think everyone is justified in making ambitious plans for the year. It has been forecast that during this year American business will spend in the range of \$55 billion in new plant and equipment. This will improve what is already the world's greatest industrial system. Let's have an affirmative approach to operation 1966, keeping in mind that those who have a negative approach to the problems of life receive only the leavings of life, the crumbs from life's banquet table.

I am not inferring that we shall have a perfect year; surely, we will have some disappointments. It has been said that into every life some rain must fall. If we did not have some ugliness, we could not appreciate beauty. If we did not have the valleys, the mountains would not be attractive. Regardless of efficiency, we will always have some disappointments but that is no reason to lose our independent status and ask for a governmental handout. When one stands in the sunshine, his body reflects a shadow, but if he faces the sun, the shadow falls behind. A positive approach to problems bring satisfactory solutions.

A study of the biographies of men and women who have left worthy footprints on

the sands of time show that the decisive factors in their achievements were internal. The outstanding manufacturer possesses something in his heart and mind that cannot be found in any particular chapter on any special page in a book, and no governmental regulation can ever eradicate it. A Government regulation cannot take the place of sound judgment.

The purpose of your business and mine is to make a profit for those who invest their capital with us; otherwise, they will not invest. In many sections of the world, the profit motive seems to be outlawed; however, we still think it is in the inner recesses of the hearts of all men. The desire to have and to own is deeply imbedded in human nature. I am reminded of the parody:

"Count that day lost,  
Whose low descending sun,  
Sees bids put in at cost  
And business done for fun."

The hope of a free America lies in the vigor and enterprise of its citizens, personal and corporate, coupled with the right to make a profit and keep a part of it. Mr. Webster defines profit as "the excess of returns over expenditures in a given transaction." Let's remember that meager profits over a long period of time indicate meager management over the same period of time, and it is through profits that we are able to support our families, pay the heavy burden of taxes, maintain churches, schools, etc. Let's ever be ready to defend the profit system—it is the basis of our economic stability and freedom.

There are some people that seem to feel that all big business is subject to criticism, and they do not know why they feel that way. I am inclined to believe that the people who hold such criticism are uninformed as to the services and the living standard made possible by business performance; therefore, business in general needs to inform more completely the public as to its role in our economy. Business needs to:

1. Tell the facts about the role of profits in providing our present level of employment.
2. Explain how profits and profits only determine how much a business can expand employment in the future.
3. Show in indisputable figures the small share of the gross national product that is finally distributed as profits.
4. Have people understand that everybody profits from profits—worker, owner, consumer alike, for business is strong only when profits are reasonable, and strong business, and strong business only, can insure high levels of employment.

When a company does not make a profit, it pays no taxes, it does not help support the Government, and provides fewer and fewer jobs because it cannot afford money for new products and new markets. It cannot increase wages and finally the jobs play out. Therefore, profit without exploitation either directly or indirectly benefits everyone, and any organization which hampers the making of a reasonable profit is working to its own disadvantage. In fact, profit is the workman's best friend because no company can continue to exist if it continues not to make a profit. When an organization attacks the profit system, it is attacking the permanency of the jobs of its own members.

If I should want to make a slave out of you, I would try to relieve you of the responsibility of your own welfare and to make you dependent upon me for food, clothing, housing, and other necessities of life. After a few years of such dependence, you would be helpless, subject to my every command. You could do only my bidding.

Our most precious American heritage is freedom. Freedom is easily lost. It is lost

just as surely when people lack self-reliance and put too much dependence on Government. It is lost when the individual is deprived of his right to speak up, to work at a job of his own choosing, to take risks, to compete in business, to earn a profit, and to keep as his own a fair share of what he earns. Freedom remains only when men, in their daily lives, practice it, apply it, and protect it.

It has been said that the most vital spot to concentrate is not where laws are made but where lawmakers are made. Lawmakers usually heed the voice of the people they believe are responsible for getting them elected. Therefore, a change in any trend must come from the bottom up and not from the top down.

Let's remember we can't vote ourselves security; we have to produce it and protect it. For many years unwise leaders have, in effect, proclaimed, "Give me your support and I will care for you. I will take from others and give you a living for which you don't have to work." Over the years men have drugged themselves into that dreaming and have wakened up as virtual slaves.

In the year 1960 Charles R. Slight, Jr., president of the National Association of Manufacturers, said the following: "The National Association of Manufacturers therefore stands squarely for the preservation of our system of individual opportunity and personal freedom. By this, NAM does not maintain that the American system, as it now exists, is perfect. It fully recognizes that the performance of the manufacturing industry can be improved, and it intends to do everything within its power to promote such improvement. But NAM holds firmly to the belief that the American economic system and individual freedom are inseparable. There can be no compromise between a free economy and a total-state economy because any such compromise will endanger political and personal as well as economic freedom."

Our major job, it seems to me, is reselling Americans on Americanism. If we turn further toward socialism, it will not be the result of any Russian propaganda economic or military movements. It will be our doing—or may I say our own undoing.

For too many years, farmers, business and professional men have sat on the sidelines in the great game of politics. Lobbyists and business associates are no substitute for those who personally take an interest in any problem. Democracy for the individual is not a spectator sport. It demands participation because people are the muscles of a democracy. Every citizen should exercise his prerogatives in order to give the kind of performance required of free people.

The United States with its high standard of living is an example of a country that placed opportunity ahead of handouts, and it is with aching hearts that we see trends now placing the welfare state ahead of individual freedom. We know there should be no subsidy for laziness, incompetence or lack of will to perform. The free way of life is somewhat rugged and painful at times, but it has paid the biggest dividends on earth and is worthy of whatever it takes to maintain it. Freedom appeals to man's strength; the welfare state appeals to man's weakness. Freedom teaches a man to stand independently on his own feet; the welfare state teaches him to lose himself in the protective herd.

Freedom is lost when the demands of the state take over the rights of the individual. It is lost when the individual is deprived of his right to earn a profit and to keep as his own a fair share of what he earns. Freedom is lost when currency loses its value; therefore, our country needs fiscal heroism, dollar defense, including soldiers in the battle against inflation. In national finances, we

have been drifting for a number of years, and let's remember that drifting articles (dollars) always go downstream.

We are reminded that Ella Wheeler Wilcox once wrote:

"One ship drives east,  
another west,  
With the self-same gale  
that blows;  
'Tis the set of the sail  
and not the gale  
That determines the way we go."

It is certainly time for us to examine the setting of our financial sails and steer our ship of government into the harbor of personal responsibility and there permanently drop anchor. If we do not change the trend, we will, I fear, trade our freedom for an ultimate withering subsidy and become a subject rather than a citizen.

Kipling once wrote:

"God of our fathers, known of old,  
Lord of our farflung battle lines,  
Beneath whose awful hand we hold,  
Dominion over palm and pine,  
Lord, God of Hosts, be with us yet,  
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

Let's never forget what? History reveals that every nation that has followed the primrose path of the welfare state has lost the value of its currency and the individual has lost his economic freedom.

We are firmly of the opinion that in the afternoon of life when the gold of the sunset has been driven away by the gray of the twilight, there will be more dignity, joy, and freedom in living off the profits that we have created for ourselves rather than in wondering for whom to vote in order to keep a political stipend from being cut.

There is a poem I like very much:

"Truth forever on the scaffold,  
Wrong forever on the throne,  
Yet the scaffold sways the future,  
And behind the dim unknown  
Standeth God, within the shadow,  
Keeping watch above His own."

I know you join me in the prayer that tonight God is somewhere out there watching over America, and that in some way, some how He will give us the courage to retain the principles that have made our country the most blessed place this side of Heaven.

#### FAIR TRIAL AND FREE PRESS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Raymond L. Spangler, publisher of the Redwood City, Calif., Tribune, and national president of Sigma Delta Chi, has been active in journalism and public affairs for some 41 years, and he has an unusually keen ability to analyze the news. Following is an address entitled, "Fair Trial and Free Press," which was given by Mr. Spangler as the second annual Carlos McClatchy Memorial Lecture at Stanford University on Monday, February 14. The Carlos McClatchy Memorial Lecture was established in 1964 to bring to the university newspapermen who have distinguished themselves in public life.

#### FAIR TRIAL AND FREE PRESS

(By Raymond L. Spangler, at the Carlos McClatchy Memorial Lecture, Stanford University, February 14, 1966)

When Mr. Weigle and I discussed the topic for this lecture we decided on fair trial and free press in order to explore again the thesis that this is not a matter of choice; rather that you can't have one without the other. This has been a popular theme with lecturing editors. J. Russell Wiggins, editor of the Washington Post, did it for the Nieman report in March of 1964. Angelus T. Burch, then associate editor of the Chicago Daily News, told the bar association of the State of Kansas about the same thing in 1955. Vermont Royster, editor of the Wall Street Journal, used the same title in February 1965, for the North Carolina Law Review. Yet things are happening so rapidly in this national conflict between the press and the bar in 1966 that I'm no longer certain that our dialog is amicable or that it is leading to mutual understanding.

The average person, if there is any such, probably could not care less except in two points of contact: When a crime is committed by someone else, he wants to know all about it. That's free press. But if the crime involves him, he wants it kept out of the paper. That's fair trial.

In the Bill of Rights we have article I: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press."

Then we have article VI: "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense."

At first blush there doesn't seem to be any conflict between these two; but there is, and the discussions between the press and the bar have been going on for decades. We—the press—are accused of poisoning the font of justice before it begins to flow by publishing prejudicial material.

These discussions have been heating up to the point that in January of this year the Freedom of Information Center at the University of Missouri felt it necessary to issue a special situation paper discussing the chronology of curbs, suggested and enforced, on the release of information concerning and the coverage of crime in criminal proceedings 1963 through 1965. It was prompted by a series of exceptional judicial actions barring pretrial and trial coverage which erupted in November and December of last year in several Western States.

One of the most interesting of these cases occurred in Tucson, Ariz.

Gretchen and Wendy Fritz, teenage daughters of Dr. and Mrs. William Fritz of Tucson, disappeared last August 16. Their bodies were found in the desert north of the city on November 10. Alleen Rowe, 15, disappeared May 31. Her body has not been found.

Charles Howard Schmid, Jr., 23, Tucson, is charged with the murder of all three in two separate actions. Two other defendants were charged in the Rowe case. They have entered pleas of guilty, have been sentenced and have offered to testify against Schmid.

The attorney for Schmid requested the court to restrain the district attorney, the sheriff and the chief of police from making any comment, written, oral or visual in the Schmid case to the press.

The judge issued the order but he crossed out the words "to the press." He thus muzzled the officers completely except in preparation of the case to court trial, or further investigation related to law enforcement. The order was issued November 23. The press and the public were barred from the preliminary hearing.

George Rosenberg, managing editor of the Tucson Daily Citizen, went down fighting. He called upon the spokesmen for the press throughout the country to issue statements. They complied. Most of them denounced the judge.

The issue was at a stalemate until a college editor on the University of Arizona campus, a bright young man named Sotomayor, printed a fiery editorial demanding to know where are the fighting editors of Arizona today.

Sigma Delta Chi, the professional journalism society of which I happen to be president, got into the act through its Southern Arizona Professional Chapter at Tucson. It voted to fight the judge's order all the way to the Supreme Court.

There is no unanimity of opinion on this matter among the press. William Matthews, editor of the Star in Tucson, said the judge was right and we who protest are fools.

Parenthetically, those of you who are worried about the editorial integrity of the two San Francisco newspapers which merged recently into a common printing operation, may take some heart from the Tucson incident. The two Tucson newspapers are in court on an antitrust matter. They, too, are printed in a common plant, and now have common ownership. However confusing, the difference of opinion between Mr. Rosenberg and Mr. Matthews is exemplary in this situation. It demonstrates editorial independence in two sides of the same house.

However, we have not been able to persuade Mr. Rosenberg's paper to become an aggrieved party in the Schmid matter and to appeal the judge's order, even though the judge himself suggested that his order, since it is without precedent, be tested. This fight may be lost not for want of valor, but because we lack a legally constituted champion.

The danger of the Tucson order—unlimited in either time or scope—is that it establishes a precedent.

By way of illustration, let me read you a recent Associated Press story from Bastrop, Tex.: "District Judge Leslie D. Williams warned officers of his court from the sheriff up or down against saying anything about any case, any crime, anything until it comes into this court. The judge told news reporters they could use what they heard coming from the witness stand in open court, but that was all."

This is the judge's interpretation of the new Texas law which went into effect January 1. This law says in part: "It is the duty of the trial court, the attorney representing the State, the attorney representing the accused and all officers of the law to so conduct themselves as to insure the defendant of a fair trial upon the presumption of innocence and at the same time afford the public the benefit of a free press"—a masterful restatement of the problem, but with no solution.

Obviously, the Texas judge believes that the free press has a right to print news, but no right to gather it.

Many members of the bar openly advocate the English system.

In England newspapers have been held in contempt and have been punished for discussing evidence which was later ruled inadmissible; for doing their own detective work and publishing that; for revealing facts not brought out in open court, or for publishing pictures of the accused.

Only by limiting its accounts to a fair and accurate report of trial proceedings as they progress can a newspaper man in England feel safe from judicial retaliation. The law is also entirely judge made and judge controlled, and I believe this is what we now see evolving in the United States despite the first amendment. The English newspapers, however, sat on the Christine Keeler-John Profumo case for 6 months. In this country that conspiracy of silence would have made us partners in the crime.

If England, Texas and Arizona are a bit remote, let us take a look at California.

Here we have the judicial council with certain delegated authorities in the administration of our State courts.

This council met in San Francisco November 26 and voted to prohibit newspaper photography, recording for broadcast, and broadcasting within a courtroom while the court is in session or during any midmorning or midafternoon recess, except for ceremonials. The vote was 17 to 1.

That single no vote was cast by Assemblyman George Willson of Huntington Park, who is chairman of the assembly judiciary committee. This committee is conducting hearings throughout the State on the very issue of fair trial and free press, and before the committee could complete its hearings, the judicial council acted with the force of law.

This judicial council rule went into effect January 1 of this year. There was no great change in the reporting of criminal trials in California.

This is because of canon 35 of the American Bar Association. It was adopted September 30, 1937, and amended in 1952. While it is advisory only, it is an ethic and it has prevented photography, broadcasting and telecasting in the courtrooms almost entirely.

It originated because one of the great sins of the press, the coverage of the trial of Bruno Hauptman for the kidnap-murder of the Lindbergh baby.

Eye witnesses have described the trial as a roman holiday. Photographers climbed on counsel's tables and shoved their flash bulbs in the faces of witnesses. The judge lost control of his courtroom and the press photographers lost control of their senses.

For 30 years the press has been fighting canon 35. We in Redwood City on rare occasions have succeeded in taking pictures of criminal trials, with permission of the judge, and without disrupting the trial or poisoning the font of justice.

There intervened, meanwhile, another famous trial which involves a fellow journalist. He was Billy Sol Estes.

In 1962 Mr. Estes was president of the Pecos Printing Co. of Pecos, Tex., publishers of the Pecos News, issued mornings except Monday. Circulation figures were not available.

The rival newspaper was the Pecos Independent. The editor was Oscar Griffin, who subsequently was hired by the Houston Chronicle as a general assignment reporter.

Mr. Griffin was 28 years old at the time. He is a native of Liberty, Tex., and prior to becoming editor in Pecos he had been editor of the Canyon Texas News, the Fort Bliss News, and served as public relations director for his hometown. The Pecos Independent was founded in 1887, at last report had a circulation of 3,191, and publishes on Mondays and Thursdays.

In 1963 Sigma Delta Chi presented Mr. Griffin a citation which read as follows: "Mr. Griffin is cited for his initiative, persistence, and courage in first disclosing and then diligently reporting the illegal activities which have since become known as the Billie Sol Estes case; for conducting and reporting his investigations with thoroughness, clarity, and a high sense of civic and journalistic responsibility, and for demonstrating memo-

rably the benefits of a free and independent press."

In 1963 Billie Sol Estes was sentenced to 15 years in prison for mail fraud and conspiracy in manipulating worthless fertilizer tank mortgages worth \$24 million. U.S. District Judge R. E. Thomason described the onetime millionaire financier as the most gigantic swindler in history. This was the Federal case.

In 1962, a State trial jury convicted the promoter on a charge of swindling and set his sentence at 8 years in the State penitentiary. The Federal and State terms were to run concurrently.

The State conviction was appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court. A decision was handed down June 7, 1965. The State conviction was reversed by a vote of 5 to 4.

Mr. Justice Stewart, Mr. Justice Black, Mr. Justice Brennan, and Mr. Justice White dissented.

Mr. Justice Clark delivered the opinion of the court. The Chief Justice gave some views of his own, and Mr. Justice Harlan cast the deciding vote in an opinion which concurred in a limited area.

The entire issue was the televising and broadcasting of a 2-day pretrial session of the trial court in Tyler, Tex. The conviction was reversed because this pretrial session, where no evidence was introduced, was televised. Now here were nine men, and I doubt that any one of them has had any experience with a televised or broadcast trial. Lacking that experience, the majority Supreme Court opinion reflected a great deal of speculation.

The following quotations indicate the court's confessed lack of knowledge in the critical points involved: The influence of television and newspaper cameras and radio microphones on the jury, the witnesses, and the court.

Said the court and I quote: "Still one cannot put his finger on its specific mischief and prove with particularity wherein he was prejudiced. \* \* \* The conscious or unconscious effect that this may have on the juror's judgment cannot be evaluated \* \* \*. The impact upon a witness of the knowledge that he is being viewed by a vast audience is simply incalculable \* \* \*. And even in the absence of sound, the influences of such viewing upon the attitude of the witness toward testifying his frame of mind upon taking the stand or his apprehension of withering cross-examination defy objective assessment."

Mr. Chief Justice Warren apprehended this speculative weakness in the majority opinion and submitted his own opinion with which Mr. Justice Douglas and Mr. Justice Goldberg joined.

In this the Chief Justice said: "I wish to emphasize that our condemnation of televised criminal trial is not based on generalities or abstract fears \* \* \*", and then in what may be the Freudian judicial slip of the century, in a decision denying pictorial description of a criminal trial, he appended seven photographs taken in the criminal courtroom of Texas where Billie Sol Estes was convicted.

A great (in my opinion) dissent was written by Mr. Justice Stewart when he said: "What ultimately emerges from this record, therefore, is one bald question—whether the 14th amendment of the U.S. Constitution prohibits all television cameras from a State courtroom whenever a criminal trial is in progress. In the light of this record and what we now know about the impact of television on a criminal trial, I can find no such prohibition in the 14th amendment or in any other provision of the Constitution."

"While no first amendment claim is made in this case, there are intimations in the opinions filed by the brethren in the majority which strike me as disturbingly alien to the 1st and 14th amendments' guarantees against Federal or State interference with the free

communication of information and ideas. The suggestion that there are limits upon the public's right to know what goes on in the courts causes me deep concern. The idea of imposing upon any medium of communications the burden of justifying its presence is contrary to where I had always thought the presumption must lie in the area of first amendment freedoms—and the proposition that nonparticipants in a trial might get the wrong impression from unfettered reporting and commentary contains an invitation to censorship which I cannot accept."

No doubt the California Judicial Council was influenced by this decision. There is nothing specific in its report indicating why it was necessary to strengthen canon 35 with the Council Rule 980 on January 1. But it was done and canon 35 now has the force of law. Assemblyman Willson's committee continues its work. I had the pleasure of appearing before the committee in San Diego January 31 in the city council hearing chambers.

This is a room on the 12th floor of the city hall with special balcony rooms for still and television cameras.

Although Assemblyman Willson announced at the start of the hearing that the proceedings were being televised and taped for radio, none of us witnesses was aware of any special equipment except the peculiarly shaped microphone at the press table which picked up the sounds of the proceedings.

Contrary to the Hauptmann trial, the broadcasting, picture taking and sound recording of this hearing were entirely unobtrusive.

But even more important was the testimony of Roberta Butzbach, judge of the municipal court in Bellflower, Calif., who testified that prior to the effective date of rule 980, she had had an ordinary criminal trial televised in her court. Her testimony was as follows:

"The universal comment was that once the trial began, the presence of the news media was forgotten. All the dire predictions and suppositions as to the manner in which people would behave in such a situation simply did not happen. There were no attempts to play Hamlet or to outdo Bob Hope.

"If there was any effect at all, and I'm not certain there was, it was in the direction of a slightly greater restraint and dignity. If this was the effect, it was not only contrary to prediction, it was salutary."

And she added this philosophical note: "None now says: Let us conduct trials in secret. They merely say: Let us protect accused persons from excessive publicity.

"None now says: Let us remove society from participation in the judicial process. They merely say: We doubt the ability of society to understand the judicial process.

"Without publicity there can be no understanding. Without understanding there can be no intelligent participation. Ultimately there can be no informed electorate."

An attempt will be made to repeal or suspend Judicial Council Rule 980, but not in any hope that television of criminal trials will spring full grown from the present void. No television referee will jump from the press table, tap the top of his cap, and call for an interlude of 2 minutes while the sponsor gives his message.

We will still have canon 35.

I believe that the press will suggest an investigative committee made up of members of the Judicial Council, journalists and educators to initiate studies and evaluations to examine the rights and scopes of a free press as applied to electronic journalism and newspaper courtroom photography, the psychological effects of television, newspaper, and motion picture cameras on court personnel, witnesses and others, and possible formulation of ground rules for use of the modern tools of journalism in courtrooms.

Just as the Scopes trial challenged the theory of evolution in Tennessee, so have the judicial council and the Supreme Court challenged the evolution of communications between the courts and the public. The bar says the pad and pencil are the last word. We disagree.

Of the more recent developments in this free press and fair trial controversy, perhaps the most serious is the U.S. Supreme Court's decision to review the Dr. Sam Sheppard case—Cleveland, 1954.

Five volumes of newspaper clippings will be submitted to determine whether pretrial publicity was so prejudicial that no impartial jury could have been impanelled. These clippings may not now display the professional excellence they may appear to have had in 1954.

To refresh my mind about the newspaper side of the Sheppard case I called on an old friend and former staff member, Ellis H. Sprunger, Jr., who edited most of the Associated Press copy out of Cleveland during the trial. He is now with the San Francisco AP bureau and favored me with this letter:

"Mrs. Sam was killed July 4, 1954, at Bay Village. Police later testified in court that after her killing somebody had carefully cleaned up evidence, but not carefully enough so that blood stains would not show when detected with modern police methods. No weapon was ever found.

"Dr. Sam was not available for questioning after the slaying. His brother took him to a hospital the family owned and said he had an injured neck and could not be questioned. There apparently was not a lot of police work going on. Just why I cannot say, but it is a fact that Dr. Sam was the surgeon for the Bay Village Police Department and the friend of the mayor, who lived on the same block.

"No public physician was able to examine Dr. Sam to determine whether he actually was injured.

"There was a coroner's inquest which, as I recall, did not turn up much of anything.

"Meanwhile, pressure was building up. It all looked too pat. And at this time the Cleveland Press took a strong hand. One bit I'm sure is in the files you mention as being before the Supreme Court was a cartoon which appeared on page 1. It showed a number of civic officials and others holding up a sheet and the caption said that somebody was hiding something. The top of the head of a man showed above the sheet and it certainly looked to me like the top of Dr. Sam's head.

"At about this time the Cleveland police were called into the case. They worked carefully and energetically but apparently too late and I don't recall that they turned up any really clinching evidence.

"Finally, the city attorney at Bay Village, the son of an Ohio Supreme Court justice, signed the charge himself and Dr. Sam was arrested and taken to jail in Cleveland. Police there were unable to question him at any great length because his attorney kept requesting to see him, hinting third degree.

"In the end the jury found Dr. Sam guilty of second degree murder.

"Certainly, the trial was a Roman holiday."

The book of clippings won a reversal and freedom for Dr. Sam last year, but the reversal was itself reversed by the U.S. Court of Appeals in Ohio when it said: "Our jury system cannot survive if it is now proper to presume that jurors selected with the care taken in this case, are without intelligence, courage, and integrity necessary to their obedience to the law's command that they ignore the kind of publicity here involved."

Four Supreme Court Judges believe that a constitutional question is involved—and this may intensify the press-bar conflict particularly if it disturbs the status quo on contempt.

The landmark cases protecting both individual and press, from punishment for contempt, have thus far concerned prejudicial publication as it concerned judges only. The Pennekamp, Bridges, Los Angeles Times-Mirror cases and others brought about the "clear and present danger" concept—that a constructive contempt, away from the immediate presence of the court, would not be punished unless it could be shown that a clear and present danger existed to the administration of justice. The theory is that judges would not be so endangered because, forsooth, they are judges.

Yet, judges have been throwing newspapermen in jail for generations.

Ralph Conley is a 53-year-old reporter for the Wheeling, W. Va., Intelligencer. He is a 10-year veteran with that paper, and a 25-year senior in newspaper work. He was assigned to cover the New Martinsville area.

On Saturday, January 15 of this year he wrote a story listing five civil actions which had been set for trial on Tuesday, January 18 in the Wetzel County Circuit Court by Judge Lloyd Arnold. After listing them he wrote this:

"Probably the most interesting case is that of Mrs. Frances Ripley versus the city of Paden City.

"Mrs. Ripley, a resident of Paden City, and wife of Leo Ripley, fell into an open sidewalk grating on January 22, 1965, and seeks recovery of damages for \$24,000.

"In her petition, she claims permanent injury and that the fall resulted in a compound fracture of her left leg, and other injuries.

"The city carries a \$100,000 liability insurance policy and the city council acknowledged fault and recommended in a letter to the insurance carrier that the claim be paid. However, no payment has been received and the suit followed.

"Attorney Jack Hawkins represents the plaintiff, and Hassig & Snyder are attorneys for the defendant."

On Monday, January 17 Judge Arnold sent an officer to ask Conley to come to his office. At the conclusion of the interview and after Conley left, the judge prepared a rule of contempt directed to Conley. It was served on Conley that morning.

A courtroom hearing before Judge Arnold was scheduled at 2 p.m. the same day.

Judge Arnold concluded the hearing by finding that publication of the news story obstructed and impeded the operation of his court and that accordingly Conley was in contempt. The judge sentenced him to 5 days in jail, fined him \$10 and ordered the sheriff to place him in jail immediately.

Attorneys for Conley appeared before Judge Arnold the next morning and orally moved that the judgment of contempt be set aside, that a new hearing be awarded, and that Conley be discharged from jail. Arguments on these motions were heard at 1 p.m. Tuesday. The attorneys submitted four grounds for the motion, including the first amendment, and the judge overruled the motions. Thereon the attorneys for Conley moved for a stay of the proceedings in order that they might appeal the judge's decision to the Supreme Court of Appeals. The judge granted a 60-day stay, setting bond in the amount of \$50. Conley was subsequently released after 24 hours in jail, and went back to work.

The case is pending.

The city council action was a matter of record.

Then there was the 1964 case of Will Harrison, a 50-year-old columnist for the New

Mexican, 14,000 circulation, published at Santa Fe. He presumed to make an adverse comparison of two drunk driving cases before a Santa Fe judge.

In one case, a Mexican-American boy filled up on wine, had an auto accident and killed three persons. He was sentenced to the penitentiary for 1 to 5 years.

In the other case, a former assistant district attorney wiped out a family of five while driving under the influence, but was given a \$500 fine, the fine was suspended and the judge announced that at the end of the year he would pronounce further sentence. Will Harrison cried "outrage" and was convicted for contempt of court on the grounds that the lawyer defendant was still on probation, thus the case was still before the court. Will Harrison died a couple of months ago, and he was, in my opinion, an unsung hero. He had been vindicated by the State Supreme Court October 4, 1965, on the grounds that no clear and present danger to the administration of justice had been shown.

But when you study constructive contempt, think about this one: In December, 1965, in Montgomery, Ala., three Ku Klux Klansmen were convicted of criminal conspiracy charges in the death of a civil rights worker. She was Viola Liuzzo, a Detroit housewife.

The judge held the jury in deliberation for 11 hours over the protest of the defense attorney, and the defense attorney announced that an appeal would be filed and bond for three men was set at \$10,000 cash.

Whereupon the President of the United States said: "The whole Nation can take heart from the fact that there are those in the South who believe in justice in racial matters and were determined not to stand for acts of violence."

Many of us joined him in cheering that verdict in a great national example of constructive contempt of court for commenting on a case still in the process of adjudication.

Where was the voice of the bar when that transpired?

And where was the self-restraint of the press?

Both were lacking, and both must be supplied before we know whether we should be talking about fair trial and free press or fair trial versus free press.

Wiggins said it in 1964: "Newspapers, judges, and lawyers alike ought to try to improve the reporting of criminal trials. What is needed is more and better crime reporting, not less of it."

Burch said it in 1955: "It is the newspaper's duty to print the facts not to try them. That is the duty of the courts. We want every defendant to have the benefit of due process—the whole treatment, with all the trimmings. But we see too much of the undue processes that help armies of dangerous malefactors to escape conviction, indictment, or even arrest."

Vermont Royster said it in 1965: "Here the lesson experience, a thousand years of experience, was that the judicial process must be open to inspection from its beginning to its end, to the purpose that all should lie under the public gaze so that if error could not be obviated it could at least not be hidden. One instrument for this was the open court with the accused and the accusers openly confronted. Another instrument was the open press, so that nothing could be hidden from the first accusation to final judgment. The lesson of the common law was that the two were not irreconcilable, they were mutually dependent."

Today it is necessary to recognize that the hunt for the uninformed juror is fruitless, and that our reliance on the integrity of our peers is not misplaced. That is the nub of the problem, and it will not be solved by speculation; rather by careful research.

### TRAFFIC SAFETY—ACTION NEEDED NOW

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the National Trial Lawyers Association predicted recently that unless the Federal Government does something soon, deaths from motor vehicle accidents will reach 100,000 a year by 1975—double the present auto death rate.

The report of this same group of lawyers noted that while 605,000 Americans have died in all wars from the Revolution to Vietnam, road deaths in the United States have totaled 1,500,000 in only 25 years. The study revealed that the number of persons injured in highway accidents in 1964 is the same number as the total beds in all hospitals in the United States—1,700,000. These are shocking figures.

I have thought for some time that we should take steps at the national level to standardize highway signs, speeds, and so forth, in an effort to cut this needless death, injury, and destruction on our highways. Although the Federal Government has spent millions building interstate highways, we have done little or nothing at the national level to prescribe and enforce safety standards. Several years ago, when we became alarmed at the increase in accidents involving airliners, we established the Federal Aviation Agency to coordinate and improve safety in the air. Now we should establish an agency to improve safety on the ground—for automobile drivers and passengers, as well as trucks and buses.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MACKAY], a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, has gone into this problem very thoroughly and has proposed legislation to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses. I am introducing a similar bill.

The National Traffic Safety Agency, which would be headed by an Administrator comparable to the Federal Aviation Administrator, would do the following:

Establish a National Safety Research and Testing Center.

Provide leadership to achieve a more uniform traffic environment, including more uniform rules of the road, more adequate standards of safety in the manufacture of new vehicles and inspection of vehicles in use, better definition of fitness to drive, and a more uniform physical driving environment.

The proposed new Agency should not seek to supplant existing public and private agencies, but it should provide aggressive leadership to achieve a concert of action.

It is my hope that the legislation will be enacted promptly so we can begin a real effort to reduce wanton destruction on our highways.

### HAVANA TRI-CONTINENT CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation in recent weeks has watched with great interest and concern the hearings conducted by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in regard to our policy in southeast Asia.

Last week both Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Gen. Maxwell Taylor presented excellent arguments for a policy of firmness in dealing with the threat of communism in Vietnam. In view of the persistent carping of foreign policy soft liners, who would have this country retreat in the face of Communist aggression, it was most refreshing to hear the statements of experienced and knowledgeable spokesmen such as Secretary Rusk and General Taylor.

With regard to the recent Senate Foreign Relations hearings, I read with interest the accounts of testimony given to the committee by Mr. George Kennan. Mr. Kennan seems to argue that the U.S. commitment to South Vietnam has assumed exaggerated proportions and that this country should, therefore, limit or curb our efforts there.

Mr. Kennan, as we know, is credited as the creator of the original policy of containment which this country followed in its dealings with Soviet communism in Europe during the period immediately following World War II. Now it would appear that Mr. Kennan has evolved a latter-day policy of containment regarding the U.S. commitment to defend southeast Asia from the threat of aggressive communism. But, unlike his first containment policy, the general thrust of his current advice is that in 1966 we should contain our own efforts in meeting Communist expansionism in southeast Asia.

Needless to say, Mr. Kennan's remarks received wide attention in the press and on television. It is unfortunate that the American public has not been given as great exposure to the facts, circumstances, and results of a meeting held in Havana last month—the so-called Tri-Continent Conference—which spelled out the future course of Communist aggression in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The recommendations and policy statements coming out of this Havana Conference represents a veritable "Mein Kampf" of international Communist designs and aims throughout the world in

the 1960's and 1970's. And although the Soviet Union was represented by a 40-member delegation, it is well to note that the chief result of the January Havana Conference was to implement and foster the Chinese Communist thesis for eventual Communist seizure of power in countries allied to the free world.

Critics of present U.S. policy in South Vietnam, such as Mr. Kennan, make much of the ideological split between the Soviet Union and China. It is, in fact, currently fashionable in some U.S. foreign policy circles to accuse those of us who speak of the threat of communism as being simplistic in our approach. We are told that we should differentiate between the so-called various forms of communism—whether we refer to Soviet or Chinese or even North Vietnamese communism.

Yet the unanimity which the delegates of the Havana Tri-Continent Conference demonstrated on the matter of waging Chinese-style wars of liberation throughout the world points up the futility—if not the real danger—of this polemic fragmentizing of communism in the world today.

It may be true that communism is no longer monolithic as it was in the immediate post-World War II era. But the threat of Communist expansion—and the Communist design for subversion and domination of countries of the free world—is monolithic and universal in every Communist capital.

Thus it was that the basic theme of the so-called Tri-Continent Conference in Havana—a theme repeated by Soviet and Chinese Communist spokesmen alike—was a strident call for war on all fronts against the free world.

As the Soviet delegate to the Conference, Sharif P. Rashidov, stated:

We are participating in a major event in the history of the national-liberation struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The anti-imperialist struggle, with its demands for the unshakable unity of its fighting forces, has brought the peoples of our continents to a realization of the urgent necessity for an even greater consolidation, and an even greater coordination, of our struggle against our common enemy—imperialism and, first and foremost, U.S. imperialism.

The Soviet delegation earnestly appeals to all the national organizations and their movements represented at this Conference to unite in the struggle for this great goal. Let our Conference be a new stage on this road. Let it multiply and strengthen the unity of our ranks, and impart new force to the liberation struggle throughout the world.

The resolutions approved by the Conference are in the same aggressive and militaristic vein. They call for an intensified campaign of subversion and political warfare against democratic regimes of the free world.

But the larger significance of the Tri-Continent Conference in Havana does not lie in the unified pronouncement of revolutionary aims among Communist nations. For only a fatuous self-delusion has ever persuaded the soft-line Kremlinologists of the free world that the Soviets and the Chinese alike seek

Communist world domination, and by violent revolutionary means. They are as one, differing only on tactics, and timetable, and those who doubt this fact should be furnished the record of the Havana Conference as required reading.

No, the truly alarming significance of the Havana Conference last month stems from the scope and nature of participation by nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America—many of which, while purporting to be "neutralist" as between Communist and the free world, in fact are providing political and other support to the revolutionary and subversive aims of Communist bloc nations.

Indeed, all the speeches, resolutions, and actions of the delegates of the 82 nations represented at the Conference were geared to the propaganda needs and aims of aggressive international communism. In fact, the Tri-Continent Conference went much further than any similar meeting in recent years in spelling out the aggressive designs of world Communist leadership toward nations of the free world.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs I am especially concerned with the serious implications of the Conference as regards our vital national interests and commitments to the defense of the hemisphere.

The Organization of American States expressed its alarm regarding the Havana Conference in a resolution of condemnation, approved February 2, 18-0, with Mexico and Chile abstaining.

The OAS resolution reflects hemispheric concern regarding the possibility of new attempts of Communist takeovers in a number of countries, including Venezuela, Guatemala, Colombia, and Uruguay. And the Tri-Continent Conference itself serves to reemphasize the appropriateness of House Resolution 560, which only last year expressed the sense of the House regarding the need for firm U.S. policy to meet the threat of Communist intervention in the Western Hemisphere. In the light of last month's meeting in Havana, that resolution is even more pertinent today than when it was passed by an overwhelming majority of the House in September 1965.

So-called neutral, unaligned countries, with delegates participating at the Havana meeting, would do well to ponder the significance of this House resolution. It must be made abundantly clear, not only to Communist nations, but to others which seek to advance their own interest by lending themselves to Communist aims, that the United States does not intend to remain inactive in the face of any external threat to the security of the Americas.

While I am reasonably certain few, if any, nations will admit that participants at the Havana meeting were official delegates of their governments, the fact that some of the delegates even at this moment hold official positions in their respective governments is shocking indeed.

For example, the Syrian delegation included Mohammad Ali Al Khatib, Secretary General of that country's Ministry of Information. Attending as an invited guest was Mohamed Fayed from the United Arab Republic who is Director of the African Affairs at the Presidency.

African countries were well represented by official members of their governments. Tanzania sent Salim Said Rasuid, the Deputy Finance Minister. The head of Guinea's delegation was Abdoulaye Diallo, Director of Political Affairs in the Foreign Ministry, and also included the Guinean Ambassador to the United Arab Republic, Fode Cisse. Ghana was represented by Ofory Bah-Emmanuel, Director of that country's Bureau of African Affairs; and Pauline Mirande Clerk, Office of the President of Ghana. Lakhdar Brahimi, representing Algeria, is that country's Ambassador to the United Arab Republic.

Since many of the nations which were represented at the Havana Conference have been and are now receiving hundreds of millions of dollars of U.S. aid, I have written to the Secretary of State with the request that he determine the status of the delegations to the Havana meeting. I also asked the Secretary to give consideration to the termination of U.S. assistance to those nations who participated with official or semi-official delegations in accordance with section 620(i) of the Foreign Assistance Act. This provision of that act prohibits assistance under this or any other act, including sales under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any countries which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against the United States or to any countries receiving assistance from the United States.

The proceedings at last month's Tri-Continent Conference made a prima facie case regarding preparations for such aggression.

It would seem, therefore, that a State Department investigation is in order to determine, at the very least, whether U.S. economic aid should not be terminated to certain nations which were represented at the Havana meeting.

Immediately following my statement, I am attaching a full list of delegates in attendance at the January Havana meeting, as reported by the Cuban press.

Mr. Speaker, the Tri-Continent Conference clearly established that what is occurring in Vietnam is not simply localized Communist aggression, but is merely one front in a worldwide campaign against the free world.

American defeat, withdrawal or abandonment of Vietnam would not simply, as some have phrased it, roll back our Pacific front line to Wakiki. The roll-back would be to the Andes, and beyond, for Ho Chi Minh's battle plan in Vietnam is a blueprint, approved both in Moscow and Peiping, for subversive wars of aggression in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Once again we have been warned by our enemy. The United States and the free world will overlook or dismiss the Communist "Mein Kampf," as spelled out at the recent Havana Tri-Continent Conference, at its peril and the peril of future generations.

The following schedule shows in detail the delegates, observers, guests, and foreign press from the various countries. The data was compiled by Cuban author-

ities from the actual registration sheets. Delegates from 63 countries and 19 protectorates, commonwealths or colonies were in attendance.

List of accredited participants up to Jan. 10, 1966, "Year of Solidarity," 1st Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America

	Countries, protectorates, and colonies	Organizations	Accredited
<b>Delegates:</b>			
Africa.....	28	29	150
Asia.....	27	27	197
Latin America.....	27	27	165
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>512</b>
<b>Observers:</b>			
International organizations.....		5	24
Afro-Asiatic organizations.....		3	7
African organizations.....		3	8
Asiatic organizations.....		3	5
Socialist countries.....		7	20
<b>Total.....</b>		<b>21</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>Guests:</b>			
Foreign.....	23		50
Cubans.....	1		27
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>24</b>		<b>77</b>
Foreign press.....	38	95	129
<b>Total accredited participants.....</b>			<b>782</b>

**DELEGATES TO THE FIRST SOLIDARITY CONFERENCE OF THE PEOPLES OF AFRICA, ASIA, AND LATIN AMERICA, JANUARY 1966**

Raúl Roa García, President.  
Youssef El Sebal, Secretary-General.  
John Kofitettegah, Vice President.  
Pedro Medina Silva, Vice President.  
Tien Nguyen Van, Vice President.

**SOUTH AFRICA**

South African National Congress (9): Alfred Dilliza Kgokong (Presidente), Reginald September, Yusuf Mohamed Dadoo, Mzimkulu Ambrose Makiwane (SP), Thomas Titus Nkobi, Robert Resha, Joyce Judith Mbonwa (S.F.), Marie Muthoo Prágalathan Naicker, Meinrad Hsimang.

**SOUTH WEST AFRICA**

South West Africa National Union (2): Jariretundu Kozongulzi (President), Moses K. Katjuongua.

**ANGOLA**

Angolan Popular Liberation Movement (8):

Luiz Andrade de Acedo (Presidente), Miguel Baya Antonio (S.P.), Luis de Almeida, Paulo Teixeira Jorge, Spencer Nicolau, José César Augusto, Daniel Da Costa García, Mario de Andrade.

**ALGERIA**

Algerian Committee for Afro-Asian Solidarity (7):

Lakhdar Brahimi (President), Hamid Benchcherchali, Adda Benguetat, Mohamed Harieche, Ahmed Zemirline, Mohamed Meghraoui, Abdelkrim Ghorab.

**ARGENTINA**

National Committee for the Peoples Conference of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (7):

John William Cooke (Presidente), Alcira de la Peña, Carlos Alberto Lafforgue, Jorge Ruben Queijo, Juan Antonio Sander, Abel Alexis Latendokf, José Gabdiel Vazelles Ullua.

**BASUTOLAND**

Basutoland Congress Party (3): Gerd Ramoreboli (Presidente), Koenyama Chakela, Ramagele Tsinyana.

## BECHUANALAND

Bechuanaland Peoples Party (2): Peter Dick Marcuping (President), Bobby Mack.

## BOLIVIA

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (3): Mario Miranda Pacheco (President), Gabriel Porcel Salazar, Mario Monje.

## BRAZIL

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (7): Alvizio Palhano Pedreira Ferreira (President), Marcos Santos, Carlos Tavares, Celso Ridan Barcelos, Iván Ramos Ribeiro, Francisco Santilli, Alexina Lins Crespo de Paula.

## BURUNDI

Burundi Workers Federation (1): Nico-deme Bigirama (President).

## CAMBODIA

Cambodian Afro-Asian Solidarity (5): Hout Sambath (President), Un Samuth, Vutthi Thoutch, Kiv Moeng, Suncheng Sunthor.

## COLOMBIA

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (6): Diego Montaña Cuellar (President), Inés Pinto Escobar, Santiago Solarte, Camilo Losada Campos, Baltasar Fernández Alvarez, Teodosio Varela Acosta.

## CONGO (BRAZZAVILLE)

National Revolutionary Committee of the Congo (4): Julien Boukambou (President), Gustavo Aba Gandzlon, Henriette Yimbou, Dominique Ntamba.

## CONGO (LÉOPOLDVILLE)

Congo National Liberation Council (11): Gabriel Yumbu (President), Nkumu Camille, Kaputula Bernabette, Kitungo Placide, Ramazani Sebastian, Malanda Henriette, Mongali Michel, Eduard Marcel Sambu, Buka Masaku, Martin Brobey, John Ali.

## KOREA

Korean Committee for Afro-Asian Solidarity (8): Wal Lyong Kim (Presidente), Zi Sun Jon, Cheng Nam Kim, Ryon Yui Kim, Yu Yui Li, Yung Kun Kim, Te Jion Chon, and Ryung Chul Jun.

## COSTA RICA

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (3): Arnoldo Ferreto (President), Hernán Monterrosa López, and Luisa González Gutiérrez.

## CUBA

Communist Party of Cuba (41): Osmany Cienfuegos (President), Raúl Roa, Manuel Piñero, Carlos Rafael Rodríguez, Miguel Martín, José Alberto Naranjo, Leonel Soto, Haydeé Santamaría, Jesús Montané Oropesa, Lázaro Peña, José Matar, José Ramírez, Carlos Lechuga, Pelegrin Torras, Arnol Rodríguez, Juan Mier Febles, Melba Hernández, Giraldo Mazola, Eugenio R. Balari, Joaquín Más, Lázaro Mora, Eduardo Delgado, Ramón Sánchez Parodi, Carlos Alfara, Ricardo Alarcón, Fernando Alvarez Tabio, Mario García Incháustegui, Raúl Valdés Vivó, Antonio Carrillo, Jorge Serguera, Armando Entralgo, Luis García Guitart, Oscar Oramas, José Venegas, Rafael Fernández Moya, Luis García Peraza, Francisco Valdés, Arquimides Columbié, Silvio Rivera, Roberto Valdés, and Alfredo Guevara.

## CHILE

## CHILE (FRAP)

Popular Action Front (9): Salvador Allende (President), Waldo Añas Martín, Clodomiro Almeyda Medina, Elena Pedraza, Luis Figueroa, Manuel Rojas, Walterio Pierro, Jorge Monte Morago, Oscar Núñez Bravo.

## CHINA

Chinese Committee for Afro-Asian Solidarity (34): Wu Hsueh Tsien (President), Tien Min Kuo, Su Tien Yang, Ming Sin Tang, Chan An You, Yao Yao Ching Jung, So Yang (S.P.), Keng Liang (S.P.), Ta Nei Tsien, Rul Jua Hsu, Wu Hasu Shang, Yi Cheng Jung, Ning Chuan Tung, Tien Hui Chen, Yuan Hung Tao, Yang Pai Ping, Tsien Li Jen, Wuan Chen Sheng, Chen Tze Yin, Chang Chieh Hsun, Chen Yu, Chen Chuan Liao, Chu Tzu Chi, Run Ho Niem, Chang Lin Yu, Tang Hai Yeh, Yu Ying Liu, Fei Yi Li, Chi Fan Wang, Shen Yi, Chen Sheng Huang, Shou Pae Li, Yun Chun Li, Chen Lo Min.

## CYPRUS

Cyprus Solidarity Committee (3): Christoforos Christofides (President), Joseph Ymakis, Georgios Savyides.

## ECUADOR

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (2): Carlos Ramirez Ortiz (President), Teodoro Aray.

## EL SALVADOR

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (2): Sergio Pérez (President), Pedro Martínez.

## GHANA

Convention of the Peoples Party (15): John Kofitettegah (President), Nathaniel Azarco Welbeck, Winfre Asare Brown, Yan Manu, Kon Bondzie Brown, Pauline Miranda Clerk, George Awonor Williams, Ofori-Bah Emmanuel, Patrick Ofei Henaldu, Kefi Batsa, Charles L. Patterson, Dr. Ekow Daniels, Kwamina Arku-Nelson (S.P.), Cecil Mc. Hardy, Anthony Korsah Dick.

## GUADALUPE

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (4): Gerard Olivier (President), Guy Daninthe, Aude Daniel Rene, Michel Numa.

## GUATEMALA

Rebel Armed Forces (5): Luis Augusto Turcios Lima (President), Gustavo Solares Ortiz, René Cordon, Orlando Fernández Ruiz, Francisco Marroquih.

## BRITISH GUIANA

Popular Progressive Party (3): Cheddi Jagan (President), Lall Bahadur, Joseph Rodriguez.

## FRENCH GUIANA

Gulanan Committee of Solidarity to the First Tri-Continental Conference (3): Regine Prevot (President), Jean Marie Robo, Georges Giffard.

## GUINEA

Democratic Party of Guinea (7): Abdoulaye Diallo (President), Fodé Cissé (S.P.), Mamady Mohamed Sakho, Mami Kouyate, Ibrahim Kourouma, Fanta Koude, Jean Baptiste Deen.

## PORTUGUESE GUIANA

African Independence Party (5): Amílcar Cabral (President), Vasco Cabral, Pedro Pires, Domingo Ramos, Joaquín Pedro Da Silva.

## HAITI

Unified Democratic Front of National Liberation (5): Paul Lantimo (President), Jacques Lacour, Pigeon Volage, Leslie Jean, Edmond Pierre.

## HONDURAS

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (3): Ricardo Moncada Zavala (President), Raul Parra, Longino Vidal Becerra.

## INDIA

Indian Association for Afro-Asian Solidarity (14): Aruna Asaf Ali (President), Nalam Narasinha Rao, Homi F. Daji Homi, Prabhakar Menon, Jagannath Sharma, Ladli Saran Shinha, Sat Tandon, Harbans Singh, Balrat Mehta, Chatur Nadain Malviya (SP), Avloor Shirinwasi Chari, Mohammad Kellimullah, Noor Mohamed, Chandra Shekhar.

## INDONESIA

Solidarity Association of the Afro-Asian Peoples (9): Ibrahim Isa (President) (SP), Francisca Faggidaej, Willy Harlandia, Umar Said, Suhardjo, Soedhartono, Edy Soenardji, Sugiri, Margono.

## IRAN

Iranian Committee for Afro-Asian Solidarity (2): Amir Halamou Amir Dibadj Torkestani (President), Rahaman Nader Zehtab.

## IRAQ

Iraqi Committee for Afro-Asian Solidarity (1): Aboul Wahab Sallom (President) (SP).

## MAURITIUS

Progressive Party of the Mauritians People (1): Teckaram Sibsurun (President).

## ST. THOMAS AND PRINCE ISLANDS

Committee for the Liberation of St. Thomas and Prince (1): Antonio Barreto Pires Dos Santos (President).

## JAMAICA

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (2): Dennis Daly (President), Roy Jeffrey Adalphus.

## JAPAN

Japanese Committee for Afro-Asian Solidarity (10): Shizuma Kai (President), Hiroshi Ide, Toshio Tanaka, Mitsuhiro Kanekne, Masae Kitazawa (SP), Susumu Ozaki, Shesaku Ital, Yoro Ohno, Akira Nishina, Yoko Kitazawa (SF).

## JORDAN

Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee of Jordan (1): Shafik Shafik (President).

## NORTH KALIMATAN

Organization of North Kalimantan for the Solidarity of the People of Afro-Asian, Indonesia (5): Ahmad Zaldi Adruce (President), Muhammad Jais Abbas, Mohamad Kasin, Dus Tan Chon, Ahmad Mohtar.

## KENYA

Kenya African National Union (3): John Mbiyo Njonjo (President), James Robaro Heuwallan, Ernest Gitu Muni.

## LAOS

New Lao Hak Sat (5): Phoumi Vongvichit (President), Soulivong Phrasithideth, Phouthasack Khanleck, Thamavongsay Boun Nhum, Khamphay Boupha.

## LEBANON

Socialist Progressive Party (4): Farid Gebrane (President), George Salim Batal, Mouhamed Kechli, Georges Haoui.

## MALAYA

People's Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee for Malaya (3): Lee Siew Choh (President), Abdul Rahim Karim, Chia Thye Poh.

## MARTINIQUE

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (2): Edouard De Lepine (President), Marcel Manville.

## MOROCCO

National Union of Popular Forces (3): Hamid Barrada (President), Mohamed Habib Sinaceur, Mohamed Horma Bahi.

## MEXICO

National Liberation Movement (6): Hebert Castillo (President), Armando Castillejos Ortiz, Manuel Mesa Andraca, María Antonieta

Rascón Córdoba, Antonio Tenorio Adame, Salvador Bojorquez.

#### MONGOLIA

Mongolian Afro-Asiatic Committee for Solidarity (7): Chadraval Lodooidamba (President), Nauzad Bayarju, Damba Dulamyn, Pountsag Berentsodol, Narhoo Tsoqgyn, Namsarain Sodnon, Badamtar B. Baldo.

#### MOZAMBIQUE

Mozambique Liberation Front (6): Marcelino Dos Santos (President), Eugenio Machado, Mariano Natsinha, Pascoal Nhapulo, Josina Abiatar Muthemba, Madalena Jingo Juvangire.

#### NEPAL

Afro-Asiatic Solidarity Committee (1): Poorna Bahadur (President).

#### NICARAGUA

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America (3): Pedro Ruiz (President), José Pedro Rivera, José López Rivera.

#### NIGER

Sawaba Party (1): Abdoulaye Mamami (President).

#### NIGERIA

Congress of Youth of Nigeria. Socialist Peasants and Workers Party of Nigeria (4): Wahab Omorilewa Goodluck (President), Salomón Olaleye Fagbo, Elias Dupe Fadipe, Johnson Ebohom.

#### OMAN

Oficina de Omán (Oman Office) (1): Faisal Faisal (President).

#### PAKISTAN

Committee for Solidarity of the Afro-Asian Peoples (7): Maulana Aboul Hamid Khan Bhasani (President), Itaz Husain, Arif Ifitihar, Qamaruz Saman Shah, Shauka Khan, A. T. M. Mustafa, Miraj Khalio.

#### PALESTINE

Organization for the Liberation of Palestine (5): Ibrahim Abu Sitta (President), Husni Khuffash Saleh, Zuhair Rayyis, Abdul Karim Al Karmi, Sala Heddin Dabbagh.

#### PANAMA

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (4): Jorge Turner Morales (President), Francisco Gutiérrez, Roberto Madariaga Montes, Floyd Britton.

#### PARAGUAY

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (5): Carlos Valenzuela (President), Héctor Gutiérrez, Jacinto Correa, Juan Carlos Arza, Angel Gómez.

#### ARABIAN PENINSULA

Socialist Front for the Liberation of the Arabian Peninsula (1): Ahmad Jamaluddin Abdulla (President).

#### PERU

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (8): Roberto García Urrutia (President), Jesús Masa Paredes, Alberto Ramírez, Jaime Venegas Romero, Armanal Pérez Carlo, Elizardo Sánchez Lomba, Freddy Eyzaguirre Luque, Jorge Altoriga Campos.

#### PUERTO RICO

Pro-Independence Movement (4): Norman Pietri Castellon (President), Ana Livia Cordero, José Luis González Colsoo, Narciso Rabell Martínez.

#### UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Youssef El Sebal (SG OSPAA), Mohamed Kaml Bahaa Eddin (ASG OSPAA), Morsi Saad Eddin (ASG, OSPAA).

#### AFRO ASIAN

Solidarity Committee (Arab Socialist Union) (21): Khaled Mohiedlin (President),

Sohair El Calamawy, Amina Ahmed El Said, Ezz El Din Ali Moustafa, Rifaat El Mahgoub, Bahia Karam, Mohamed Diab, Sekina Sadat, Ahmed Mukhtar Kobb, Ragua Rami El Kholi, Samiha Taher Mustafa, Ahmed Reda Mohamed Khalifa, Shebl Hefez Mohame Shalaby, Mohamed Wafaey Shulkamy, Mohamed Ouda, Hoda Tawfik, Louis Grace, Anis Mansour, Edward K. F. El Kharrat, Salah El Sayer, Hussain Rizk.

#### DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (5): Guido Rafael Gil Díaz (President), Asdrubal Dominguez Guerrero, Euclides Gutiérrez Félix, Ceyetano A. Rodriguez del Prado, Carlos M. Amiana Martínez.

#### DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF NORTH VIETNAM

Solidarity Committee for Afro Asiatic (10): Tuyen Tran Danh (President), Nguyen Duy Tinh, Tuong Tran Cong, Le Nguyen Than, Con Nguyen La, Bun Le Quang, Thang Dang Thi, Phan Truong Si, Doan Dinh Ca, Nguyen Dinhh Bin.

#### RUANDA

National Union Ruanda Burundi (2): Francois Rubeka (President), Nelson Rwgasoore.

#### SENEGAL

African Independence Party (3): Mamadou Keita (President), Thierno Amath Dansoko, N'Diongue Babacar.

#### SYRIA

Afro-Asiatic Solidarity Committee (8): Moudaf Haffar (President), Morris Salibi, Mohammad Ali Al Khatib, Moustapha Amine, Rifal Nouri Mohamed, Mohammad Zouhdi Nashashibi, Ali El Khalil, Joubran Majdalan.

#### FRENCH SOMALILAND

Popular Movement Party (1): Ahmed Mobarak Mobarak.

#### SWAZILAND

Swaziland Progressive Party (2): Dingame Dominic Cain Nxumalo (President), Ephraim Mbhele.

#### SUDAN

Democratic Peoples Party (5): Aly Abdel Rahman (President), Yousif Bushara, Bilghies Ahmed, Ali Osman, Shazali Amin Shazali.

#### THAILAND

Thailand Patriotic Front (3): Bhayome Chulanond (President), Suchart Bhumimorirak, Sid Hichai Songkaraksa.

#### TANZANIA

Tanganyika African National Union (6): Salim Rasuid (President), Amanas Swai (S.P.), Muhammad Ali Foum, Lugo Taguaba, Ali Hafudh, Abdulla Said Netepe.

#### TRINIDAD-TOBAGO

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (2): George Weekes (President), George Bowrin.

#### UGANDA

Uganda Peoples Congress (5): Yomasani Kanyomozl (President), Ally Muwabe Kirunda Kivejinja, Raiti Omongin, Khahid Younis Kinene, Henry Nyakairu.

#### U.S.S.R.

Soviet Committee for Afro-Asiatic Solidarity (40): Sharaf Rashidov (President), Anatoli Sofronov, Dimitri Gorbachev, Boris Gorbachev, Vladimir Judintsev, Rodolfo Chliapnikov, Yans Vladimireki, Timur Gaidar, Natalia Berejnaia, Alexey Mayevsky, Latif Maksoudov (S.P.), Bahadur Abduzazakov, Chakhan Tiouleubekov, Vladimir Yarovol, Mirzo Tursun Zade, Zinaida Federoeva, Rasul Gamsatov, Fikriat Tabeiv, Dmitri Shevilagin, Mikhail Kossykh, Karan

Gousseinov, Bijamal Ramazanova, Tchengls Altmatov, Zouleikha Gousseinova, Grigori Lovchine, Vladimir Kokkontai, Tchermiychev Viatcheslav, Sima Panich, Nikolai Basanov, Veniamin Midtsev, Spartak Tsissanov, Richat Koudachev, Jouri Bochkarev, Rlourik Beleroutchev, Victor Boukharkov, Valeri Soukhine, Arnold Dobkine, Mikhail Kovalev, Valeri Jikharev, Petr Nicolaev.

#### URUGUAY

Leftist Liberation Front (6): Luis Pedro Bonavita Saiguero (President), Cesar Reyes Daglio, Blanca Silva Collazo Odriozola, Edmundo Soares Netto, Rodney Arismendi, and Luis Echave Zas.

#### VENEZUELA

National Liberation Front (15): Pedro Medina Silva (President), Gilberto López, Rosendo Menéndez Luz, Ciro Rodríguez, Atencio Manrique, Jerónimo Carrera, José Vicente Abreu, Héctor Marcano Coello, Héctor Pérez Marcáno, Omar Cárdenas, Moisés Moleiro, Oswaldo Barreto, Jorge Rubio, Ali González, Adolfo Gañango.

#### SOUTH VIETNAM

Afro-Asiatic Solidarity Committee (7): Tien Nguyen Van (President), Tran Van Tu, Kin Nguyen H Dang, Van Sau Ly, Cao Le Thi, Anh Trinn Van, Ba Nguyen Ngoc.

#### YEMEN

Afro-Asiatic Solidarity Committee of Yemen (1): Abdullah Al-Alawi (President).

#### SOUTH YEMEN (ADEN)

National Liberation Front of Occupied South Yemen (2): Saif A. S. Dhalee (President), Jaffer Ali Awadh.

#### ZIMBABWE

Zimbabwe African Peoples Union (9): Edward Nodlovu (President), Ethan Allen Dube, David Mpongo, Charles Tarehwa Madondo, Amos Ngunya, Arthur Musuka, Charles Chikerema, Nolada Moshe Noko, Nelson T. C. Samkange.

Total number of delegates from 82 countries is 512.

#### OBSERVERS TO CONFERENCE (ORGANIZATION AND NAMES OF OBSERVERS)

##### INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

World Peace Council (9): Enrique Lister, Alfredo M. P. Valera, Omprakash Paliwal, Francis Boaten, Juan Marinello, Angel Dominguez Santamaria, William Gollan, Oldrich Belic, Lucio Mario Luzzatto.

International Federation of Democratic Women (3): Florence Mephoshe, Helga Dickell, Vilma Espin.

World Federation of Democratic Youth (3): Eulogio Rodriguez Millares, Ctibor Citek, Rodolfo Mecchini.

International Student Union (5): Tran Van An, Kwamena Ocran, Zbynek Vokrovlicky, Félix Rodriguez, Cándido Domínguez García.

World Syndacal Federation (4): Satish Chatterjee, Mark Shope, José Bustos, Renato Bitossi.

##### SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

###### Albania

Albanian Committee of Solidarity With the People of Africa and Asia (4): Foto Cami, Sotir Kambori, Falk Zanell, Sezai Shyti.

###### Bulgaria

Committee of Afro-Asiatic Solidarity (2): Zidravke Mitovskli, Elena Gavrilova.

###### Czechoslovakia

Czechoslovakian Committee of Solidarity With the People of Africa and Asia (2): Antonin Vavrus, Vladimir Simek.

###### Hungary

Hungarian Solidarity Committee With All the Peoples which Fight for Independence (2): Andras Tardos, Eva Koltai.

**Poland**

Solidarity Committee With the People of Africa and Asia (2): Wladyslaw Sliwka, Josef Kulesza.

**German Domestic Republic**

Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee of the German Democratic Republic (7): Horst Max Brash, Edmund Rodner, Heinrich Eggebrecht, Heinz Joswig, Siglinde Arkerman, Freidel Trappan, Heinz Schmidt.

**Rumania**

Rumanian League of Friendship With the Peoples of Asia and Africa (1): Mircea Radulescu.

**AFRO-ASIAN ORGANIZATIONS**

Conference of Afro-Asian Jurists (4): Shih Sheng Chao, Hsien Wang, Fadiala Keita, Wijanto.

Permanent Bureau of Afro-Asian Writers (2): Nihal Lakshaman Rathapala, Karunaseena Jayalath.

Afro-Asian Journalists Conference (1): Dharmasena Manuweera.

**AFRICAN ORGANIZATIONS**

South West Africa Peoples Organization (4): Peter Mueshihange, Andreas Shipanga, Ewald Katjivena, Emil Appolus.

Zimbabwe African National Union (3): King David Mutasa, Simpson Victor Mtambangwe, Augustine Monbeshora.

African Syndical Federation (1): Prosper Akanni.

**ASIATIC ORGANIZATIONS**

Council Against the Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs (1): Masahuru Hatanaka.

Asian Economic Bureau (3): Samuel Diaz Bandaranaike, Theja Gunawardhana, Packeer Mohideen.

Peace Commission of Asia and the Pacific (1): Victor James.

**THOSE INVITED TO THE CONFERENCE**

Argentina: Miguel Angel Rubinich.

Bolivia: Juan Carlos Lazcano.

Brazil: Félix Athayde.

Cambodia: Helene Thoutch Vuttni.

Colombia: Marco Tulio Rodriguez Martinez, Jorge Zalamea Borda.

Congo (Brazzaville): Auguste Mahoungou, Alice Mahoungou.

Cuba: Antero Regalado Fallón, Zenén Buergo, Reinaldo Calviac, Pedro Montalván, Asela de los Santos, Radamés Mancebo, Aleida March, Juan José León, Dora Calcaño, Francisco Dorticós Baler, Orlando Rosabal Llanes, Oscar Doménoch, Lupe Véliz, Leopoldo Ariza, Enrique Velazco López, Félix Sautié Mederos, Roberto Ogando Faz, Gloria Agullera, Calixto Morales, Alejo Carpentier, Antonio Núñez Jiménez, Rolando Cubela, Nicolás Gullén, Salvador Vilaseca, Jaime Crombet, Justo Guerra, Agapito Figueroa.

Czechoslovakia: Jiri Meisner.

Chile: Juliana Rojas, Luis Eduardo Larbarca Goddard, Gonzalo Rojas Pizarrón.

Dahomey: Codjo Azodogbehov.

United States of America: Robert Williams, Rick Rhoads.

France: León Feix, Josephine Baker, Ives Fernand Moreau, Régis Jules Debray, Madam Voisin.

Guatemala: Aurora Benitez.

England: Osmon Blackburn, Jack Woddis.

Italy: Alberto Moravia, Dacia Maraini, Joyce Lussu.

Mexico: Rafael Estrada Villa, Blanca Muñoz Cota de Tenorio, Adalberto Pliego Galicia, Alberto Orduña Culebro, Louis T. Córdova Alvelais, Gilberto Ramón Gallarde, Manuel Stephens García, Manuel Marcué Pardiñas, Arturo Orona, Manuel Terrazas Guerrero.

Paraguay: José Asunción Flores, Elvio Romero.

Peru: Hilda Gadea Acosta, Mario Vargas Llosa, Patricia Llosa de Vargas.

Puerto Rico: Halina Linger de Rabell.

United Arab Republic: Mohamed Fayed, Nadia Sulficar Salvi.

Tanzania: Lidia Foun.

U.S.S.R.: Jursand Rashidova.

Uruguay: Aida De'Mattels Ventura, María Victoria Espinola Gabreta.

Venezuela: Eleana Sánchez, Elizabeth Burgos.

**FOREIGN PRESS**

Publicity organs and names of journalists

Alemania Federal

Das Andere Deutschland: Lenor Velfort.

Argentina

Diario El Mundo: Juan Lefcovich.

Belgium

Boletín Informativo de Cuba: Hugo Bency. Le Drapeau Rouge: Hubert Jacob.

Magazine Europeo: Gabriel F. Dannau, Marie Noelle Cloes, Alphonse A. Roosens.

Bulgaria

Agencia BTA: Todor Stolanov.

Canada

Canadian Tribune: Francis Williams Park, Libbie Campbell Park.

Korea

Agencia Central de Corea: Choun Tak Zi.

Costa Rica

Semanario Libertad: Francisco Gamboa Guzmán.

Czechoslovakia

Czech Broadcasting

Radio-Difusión Checoslovaca: David Leff. Agencia CTK: Jaroslav Boucek.

Lyternarny Noviny: Mrtha Dodd. Radio Difusión Praga: Vera Stocickova.

Chile

Radio Minería: Ibar Albar Varas. Las Noticias de Ultima Hora: Frida Modak Schatz.

Periódico El Siglo: Adriana Serle.

China

Agencia Sinjua: Chiu Ling, Ho Ching Kuang Jen Mu, Chi Chen, Ming Fu Ming, Yi Lun Shu, Shei Chong Hsu, Liu Chow Yang, Sun Shon Guia.

Denmark

Land Og Folk: Jan Stago. CBS News: Carl Sorensen.

Scotland

The Week: Alexander Scott.

Spain

Oficina Actualidades Argelinas: Daniel Ortiz.

Revista Triunfo: Eduardo Garcia Rico. Radial Press: Alfonso Sobrado Palomares.

United States of America

Agencia A.P.: Antonio Ortega, Isaac Flores.

Agencia U.P.I.: Gabriel Badia Diaz, Pedro Bonetti.

Mid-Week and Weekly Worker: William Allan.

The Worker: Beatrice Johnson. Jewish Daily Freiheit: Joseph North.

Finland

Televisión Finlandesa: Antti Kovanen, Esko Haapaniemi, Pekka Makinen.

France

Agencia Intermante Presse: Pierre Rondiere.

Nouvel Observateur: Claude Estier. Radio Europeo: Francois Philippe Fetjo.

Agencia A.F.P.: Sergio Mendez, Ives Doude, Robert N. Katz.

Reveu Democratic Nouvelle: Albert Paúl Lentin.

L'Entincelle: Henri Herve. Le Monde: Marcel Niedergang.

L'Express: Edouard Balby. Le Partisans: Francois Maspard.

Guinea

Prensa de la República de Guinea: Bob Sow.

Great Britain

Agencia Reuters: Michael Arkus, María Isabel Arostegui.

Sunday Telegraph: Charles Iam Lumsden. Evening Standard London: Peter Kingsley.

Holland

Algemeen Dagblad: Leo Klatser.

Hungary

Radio y TV Budapest: Lazlo D'Salgo. Nepszabadsag Daily: George Kalmar.

Agencia Telegráfica Húngara: Havel Jozsef.

Iran

Shahbay: Rahim Hamyar.

Italy

L'Unita: Saverio Tutino, Gaetano Pagano. El Mundo Nuevo, L'Astrolabile, Il Ponte: Mario Lana.

Foto Reporter: Antonio Sansone. Giornale D'Italia: Giuseppe Dall'Oncaro.

Japan

NHK Radio Telesivora del Japon: Hiroshi Shiohazaki, Kyoichi Hoshino, Kentaro Hirayana.

Asahi Shimibun: Bin Watanabe. Periódico Yomiuri: Takeshi Ogawa.

Morocco

Diario Alkifah: Abdallah Layachi. Diarie L'Avant Garde: Tibary Moussador.

México

Cuadernos Americanos: Sol Arguedas. Revista Siempre: Marta Solís, Alberto Gutiérrez Sánchez, Eduardo del Río García.

Revista Política: Raquel Rabinovich, Carlos Perzabal Marcué.

Norway

Orientering: Oysteith Pettersen.

Poland

Zicie Warsawy: Aniela Krupinska. Agencia PAP: Mirosław Iconowicz.

Dookols Swiata: Andrzej Binkowski. Editory Office Gromada: Henryk Borzecki.

Polish Presse Panorama Weekly: Maciej Szczepanski.

Chtopsha Droga: Lesack Mackow. Tribuna Ludu: Ludwuk Krassvcki.

German Democratic Republic

Agencia A.D.N.: Dieter Coburger, Wolfgang Mayer, Peter Neinz Junge.

Televisión R.D.A.: Erich Friedlander, Peter Goeschke, Hannelore Coburger.

Deutscher Demokratischer RunFunk: Manfred Schroeder. Neues Deutschland: Lore Peter.

Democratic Republic of Vietnam

Agencia Noticiosa de Vietnam: Au Vu San. Faillm: Cuong Ly, Cuong Nguyen Duy, Nguyen Nhu Ai.

Rumania

Ager Press: Victor Stonate.

Sweden

Nydag: Karl Staff.

Switzerland

L'Illustre: Luc Bernard Chesex.

Tanzania

Uhuru: Dadu Hamdum Mansur. Unión Nacional Africana de Tanganyika: James Gilbert Markham.

Tunisia

Periódico Les Temps Moderns: Rachid Cheriff.

U.S.S.R.

Periódico de "Trud": Gueorgui Tikhonov. Tass: Alexis Stoujine, Mikhail Artichenkov, Valery Laskarlov, Ruslan Kniasev.

Radio y TV U.S.S.R.: Sergio Pokin, Vladimir Pugachev.

Pravda: Yuri Pogosov.

Izvestia: Vladimir Silatiev.  
 Novosti: Valentin Mashkin, Yuri Paporovo,  
 Mijail Roy.  
 Konsomolskaja Pravda: Alexandre Krivo-  
 palov.  
 Maladal Comunist: Lev Kornechov.  
 Literoturnaya Gazeta: Rimma Kazanora.  
 Uruguay  
 El Popular: Ricardo Saxlund.  
 Semanario Marcha: Carlos Nufiez.  
 Diario Epoca: Manrique Salbarrey.  
 South Vietnam  
 Agencia del Frente de Liberación Nacional  
 Vo Son Ca.

Yugoslavia  
 Agencia de Prensa Tanjug: Boza Rafaj-  
 lovic.  
 Total foreign press and news media rep-  
 resentatives from 37 countries: 129.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama on the statement that he is making and also on the record that he has made as chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I am referring particularly to the work that he has done in bringing out some of the facts about this recent Havana Conference, because such a meeting and the attitude and identity of the participants have great significance for us in determining the path that we should follow in the pursuit of our foreign policy.

I believe that the gentleman from Alabama will agree that a study of the Conference proceedings show that this was a Russian-organized meeting, that the facade of universal action was pretty thin.

At the same time there was one significant result of this heavy-handed Conference that I should like to mention, and that was the reaction to its subversive activities and pronouncements of the countries of Latin America themselves. When the members of the Organization of American States heard of the action which had taken place, without any dissenting vote, they proceeded to take prompt action to deplore the revolutionary policies that were set forth and the stated interventionist objectives of this conference.

Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy that subsequent to this Latin American action, whether for publicity purposes or otherwise, there was a very prompt verbal backtracking on the part of the Russians themselves perhaps because they did not appreciate completely the depth of the reaction in the Latin American countries to this conference. At any rate, the avowed sponsorship of subversion and intervention accords ill with the oft-stated Soviet objective of building bridges to the Western world.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the gentleman from Alabama should be complimented and commended for the work that he and the committee have done on this subject.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, who is a very able member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] in complimenting the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] on the presentation that he is making here this afternoon, and to say further that it is a pleasure to serve on the Inter-American Subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

Mr. Speaker, the Tri-Continental Conference held only recently in Havana, Cuba, means that there has been set up in Cuba now a headquarters for the subversion, if possible, of the entire Latin American area. This, of course, poses some real problems—and growing problems—for the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] is doing all that he can to bring forth, as he has in hearings dealing with this Tri-Continental Conference, the making aware—making the public aware—of what is taking place, what has taken place, and what may very well take place throughout the entire Latin American area.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman further, and to the Members of the House, that it is a sad and sorry situation when the taxpayers' money—approximately \$1 million of the taxpayers' money of this country—is being used through the United Nations to support a technological college in Havana, Cuba, for the purpose—ostensible purpose—of further training those who would subvert the rest of Latin America.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Inter-American Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will take further action to denounce this use of American funds for this purpose.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

Mr. SELDEN. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, who also is an extremely able member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. I, too, am concerned in connection with the announcement that American taxpayers' dollars are to be used to support a technological college in Havana, Cuba. I have called this announcement to the attention of the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, which has jurisdiction over this subject, with the request that the subcommittee look into it. Since the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is a member of that particular subcommittee also, I feel certain he will want to make a similar request.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Wyoming.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], for an enlightening and most helpful speech. I am pleased to associate myself with his remarks, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly hope that debate in the Congress this past week will not weaken in any conceivable way our determination to act unilaterally

and ex parte if necessary to meet totalitarian aggression in our hemisphere.

When the President took the bold and decisive action he did, nearly a year ago, to put down the Santo Domingo rebellion, I believe I was one of the first voices in Congress to laud his leadership. I also voted for H.R. 560—with a vast majority of my colleagues in this House and in the Senate—to support his leadership in meeting totalitarian aggression anywhere in the world.

If the Santo Domingo incident were to have happened next week, and the President respond as he did, I would again hail his action and again vote my confidence in his leadership.

I firmly believe that the last thing our fighting men in Vietnam need today, Mr. Speaker, are 535 commanders in chief holding forth in the Congress.

#### THE FEUD AMONG FEDERAL JUDGES IN OKLAHOMA CITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on file in the U.S. Supreme Court, ignored and gathering dust for nearly 4 years, is an official transcript that sets forth in detail the shocking story of a bitter feud among Federal judges in Oklahoma City, Okla.

The transcript is the verbatim statement of Federal Judge Stephen S. Chandler in which he accuses Federal Judges Alfred P. Murrah and Luther Bohanon of persecution.

Chandler's testimony was given before the Judicial Council of the 10th Circuit Court, sitting in Wichita, Kans., on April 25, 1962, after Chandler had been disqualified by the Judicial Council from presiding in a bankruptcy proceeding.

Federal Judge Chandler asserts in the transcript that Federal Judge Murrah sometimes cursed him, once tried to get him to alter his estimate of property values in a certain case; that his telephone was tapped, and he was afraid of being poisoned.

He accused Federal Judge Bohanon of spying on him, circulating rumors about him, and soliciting a bribe. Chandler said that in 1942, Bohanon offered to get him appointed as a Federal judge for \$25,000. Bohanon was a lawyer at that time. It was on January 30, 1962, said Chandler, that Bohanon's attitude toward him changed from warm friendship to bitter hatred.

Murrah is the chief judge of the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals. It was the judges of this circuit, sitting as the judicial council, that disqualified Chandler from further jurisdiction in the bankruptcy case and, on December 13, 1965, stripped him of all judicial power and authority, leaving him only his title and \$30,000 a year salary.

For all practical purposes this amounted to impeachment—an action which, under the Constitution of the United States, is vested only in the Congress, and Judge Chandler describes this action as a usurpation of power.

Subsequently, in February of this year—1966—and because of protests both

in and out of Congress, the same judicial council of the 10th circuit restored to Judge Chandler some 160 of the cases which had previously been taken from him. This simply compounded the deliberate assumption of power implicit in the original action.

Throughout the 57-page transcript on file in the Supreme Court, the heart of Chandler's testimony is that he has been the victim of Murrah's bitter hatred for 19 years.

Pointing to his disqualification in the bankruptcy case, Chandler said:

This whole proceeding is actuated by malice and aided and abetted and assisted and really engineered by Judge Murrah and Judge Bohanon.

In the bankruptcy case, Parker Petroleum Co. was the debtor. It filed a petition for reorganization in U.S. district court in Oklahoma City on May 6, 1958. Since outside financing was necessary, Occidental Petroleum, of Los Angeles, holder of 40,000 shares of Parker stock, filed a reorganization plan for Parker Petroleum on August 14, 1959.

There followed months of litigation. Occidental tried to withdraw but Chandler held it could not legally do so. He was reversed by the 10th circuit but the liability of Occidental for damages was left open and the case returned to Chandler.

Occidental then requested Chandler to disqualify himself but before he could rule on that request Occidental took the litigation to the 10th circuit. Chandler was promptly ordered out of the case.

He fought back because, he said, he had unwittingly caused Parker Petroleum to have confidence in Occidental Petroleum mainly because Bert Barefoot, Jr., former law partner of Judge Bohanon, and a lawyer for Occidental, had made unconditional pledges of financial support.

He charged Barefoot with a conflict of interest on the grounds that he represented two parties in the litigation, Barefoot, Chandler said, became "menacing," adding that "he began spitting in my face and he took charge of the court and entered orders and it was pretty bad."

In the case in which he fixed the value of some property, Judge Chandler testified that Judge Murrah called him into his chambers and said:

Now you have got to change that \* \* \*. You are going to delay our building here.

Chandler said he replied that his appraisal was right, and he refused to change it whereupon, said Chandler:

He [Murrah] jumped up and said "You (so-and-so) yellow son of a (so-and-so). I have worked for 7 years on this building and here you do that and we don't get it."

Chandler testified that on another occasion Murrah asked him to set aside an order in a jury case. He refused and Murrah then said according to Chandler:

Well, every other judge of the circuit does what I tell them to. I don't know what the hell is wrong with you that you won't.

Mr. Speaker, I have never met a single one of the principals involved in this situation. I have in no way communicated

with any of them nor have they communicated with me. I have no personal knowledge of the character or qualifications of these jurists, all of whom are now holding places of the highest trust and responsibility.

I do know that when a Federal district judge sits before a tribunal of four Federal circuit judges and makes the charges contained in this transcript—and for almost 4 long years little or nothing is done to prove or disprove those charges—that it is a travesty in the name of the courts and justice in this country.

As a citizen and a Member of Congress, I cannot sit idly by and watch while the respect and confidence in the Federal judiciary is undermined in Oklahoma or any other area of the Nation. And I submit that there are other areas that need attention.

I urge in the strongest terms at my command that the proper committees of Congress launch an immediate investigation.

#### THE CHILDREN'S SPECIAL MILK ACT OF 1966

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, to supplement my earlier protest over the budgetary cut in the school milk and lunch program, I have introduced a bill, which I should like to have printed in full at this point in the body of the RECORD:

H.R. 12907

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Children's Special Milk Act of 1966."*

#### LEGISLATIVE FINDING

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that the increased consumption of fluid milk by a maximum number of American children is in the public interest in order to promote public health and nutrition; to create and develop markets for dairy products produced by American farmers; and to effectively and efficiently supplement the dairy price support activities of the United States Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. The Act of July 1, 1958, as amended (72 Stat. 276; 74 Stat. 84; 75 Stat. 147; 75 Stat. 319), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Agriculture shall, under such rules and regulations as he may deem in the public interest, encourage the consumption of fluid milk by children in the United States in (1) nonprofit schools of high school grade and under, and (2) nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children. For the purposes of this Act "United States" means the fifty States and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. All sums appropriated under this Act, less such amounts as the Secretary shall determine to be reasonable and necessary for his administrative costs and reserves, shall be allocated at the earliest possible date for the use of nonprofit schools and other nonprofit institutions desiring to participate in the program and shall be used to reimburse such nonprofit schools and other nonprofit institutions for fluid milk served to children. Any such allocation, or portion thereof, which the Secretary shall determine will not be fully utilized by any such nonprofit school or other nonprofit institution as then

allocated, shall be reallocated by the Secretary so as to accomplish maximum use of such funds.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, not to exceed \$105,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, not to exceed \$110,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, not to exceed \$115,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and each succeeding fiscal year thereafter, not to exceed \$120,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to explain the intent of this bill, and some of the reasoning behind it. This bill would in effect make the present milk program permanent, and would continue to make the program available to children on the broadest practical scale. Known as the Children's Special Milk Act of 1966, my bill is explicit as to the intent of Congress both now and when the program was inaugurated in 1954.

Dairy farmers often refer to the "dual purpose cow." They mean, of course, that the cow can be used for milk during her life and that she and her offspring carry more meat than the dairy breeds. The beauty of the present special milk program is that it creates a tripurpose cow. Those three purposes constitute the three justifications for passage of my bill. They are:

First. Beneficial effects on the health and nutrition of American children.

Second. The creation of an additional market and the development of new and future markets for U.S.-produced dairy products.

Third. A better way to support the price of dairy products through greater consumption of fluid milk, rather than the subsequent purchase of manufactured dairy products by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The biggest advantage of these three purposes is that they are never at odds with one another. We can have the best elements of each. Under the administration proposal to cut the present milk program to 20 percent of its present size, you have only one purpose: distribution of milk to needy children. Market formation and support benefits are forgotten. It is purely a matter of speculation on the part of the Department of Agriculture that children now being subsidized for milk will go ahead and pay full price for it; in fact, Department projections show that present milk consumption under school programs would drop by one-third, or half a billion pounds of milk. At a time when the dairy industry continues to need the support of every available market, this seems totally unjustified.

My bill repeals the present statutory authority for the special milk program. This will remove an obsolete provision from the law when the present statute expires. It also avoids any problem of legal interpretation between the time of enactment of this bill and the scheduled termination of the present statute on June 30, 1967.

The bill further recodifies without change the provisions in the present law dealing with the eligibility of schools and other institutions for the benefits of this program. This section (4) also retains

the definition of the "United States" as it appears in present law to include the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

Another section sets forth the procedures to be followed by the Secretary of Agriculture in the administration of the program. Except for necessary administrative expenses and reserves, all available funds shall be allocated promptly and unused amounts shall be reallocated in a manner designed to accomplish the maximum effectiveness of the program.

Appropriations will be \$105 million in fiscal year 1966, \$110 million for fiscal year 1967, \$115 million for fiscal year 1968, and \$120 million for fiscal year 1969 and subsequent years on a permanent basis.

Mr. Speaker, the school milk program was used in approximately 92,000 schools in 1965, or 22,000 more schools than used the school lunch program. The usage of milk in both programs aggregated nearly 3 billion pounds. If the milk had not been so used, it would undoubtedly have been bought by the CCC, at a direct cost of about \$103 million, or exactly the present appropriation for the milk program. Congress was aware of the Nation's fiscal situation when it voted \$103 million for the special milk program, but it seems that the President's concern for inflation and the cost of the war has already forced cutbacks in the program that have been passed on to schoolchildren and school districts in the form of higher milk costs to them. Let me explain:

When President Johnson requested all his agencies to cut back on existing programs wherever possible in light of the war in Vietnam and the high employment level, the Administrator of the school milk and lunch programs directed that \$10 million be spent on the milk program instead of the \$103 million earmarked by Congress in its 1966 appropriation for that purpose. If this economy could have been achieved without changing the nature of the program, I doubt whether any Member of Congress would have legitimate grounds for complaint. As it is, however, the cutback forced the Administrator to reduce the reimbursement rate by 10 percent. This results in increased costs to the school district, and in most cases it forces them to raise the price of the milk to the children themselves. At that point, the intent of Congress is violated; the Congress was fully aware of the economic conditions in this country at the time it appropriated \$103 million for the milk program—and it fully expected that sum of money to be used to bring milk to children at the lowest possible cost to them. That cost would have remained at its previous low level had not the Department of Agriculture arbitrarily decided that this was a good place to relieve the pressure on the economy. I vehemently oppose this cutback, not only on the grounds that the intent of Congress was violated, but because it represents blatant false economy. What is more, the President's programs under the costly and badly mismanaged war on poverty are largely responsible for the pressure that brings the need for cutbacks in the first place. So we see efficient, valuable programs

being cut to the bone to make room for speculative and unproven programs at the expense of schoolchildren, who can neither afford this nor defend against it.

Mr. Speaker, this is false economy because it results in decreased consumption; it is false because we are dealing with nutrition and health here; it is false because unfavorable conditions in the dairy industry will combine with this cutback to increase the necessary support payments to dairy producers, which cost the Nation \$13 million last year as it was.

But this is only the beginning. The administration's suggested appropriation for fiscal 1967 for the two programs amounts to only two-thirds of the present total, with the largest cutback coming in the milk program, which would be diminished to less than one-third its present size. Supposedly, these two programs are going to be redirected in order to aim only at the most needy children of the country. They will, in effect, join the war on poverty. While cutting back their appropriations considerably, they will, according to the budget, require more employees than they now have in order to administer the more careful screening process. That, of course, is nothing new on the poverty front: Fewer people helped, more people administering.

Whether the consumption of milk will decrease as a result of the program cutbacks is, as I have said, still a matter of speculation. To be sure, many schools will try to offer the present milk supply to schoolchildren at cost, or no profit to themselves. At present that cost is somewhere in the neighborhood of 6 cents per half pint, but is considerably lower to schoolchildren as a result of the Federal milk program. If price setting is left up to individual school districts, that cost will in many instances be raised to 10 cents per half pint, in order to recoup costs. Needy children will be allowed to receive the milk at the present low cost, but will they now be required to bring a note from home saying that they are too poor to pay for the milk like the other children? Can we assume that all the children presently enjoying school milk will continue to do so after the price increase? We cannot. This could do serious damage to the milk intake and the health benefits of the children.

This cutback may be a savings to the Federal Government, but the money means a great deal to the parents, children, and dairy farmers who presently depend on them. A total of \$101 million is being cut from the milk and lunch budget, and who or what is being saved? Surely not the cost of the Department of Agriculture, which will increase as it becomes necessary to give more support to our dairy farmers; surely not the farmers, who will have lost part of an important sustaining market; surely not the schoolchildren, some of whom will have to stop drinking milk at school. No one gains except the final figure of the budget, which is proud to be \$101 million trimmer. Like many other aspects of the so-called Great Society, this has been revealed as an optical illusion which pretends to be that which it is not, which

gives the illusion of thrift when the cost is actually very high.

I urge every Member of Congress to give his serious consideration to the re-funding of the well-established milk program. I urge every Member to consider the futility of this exercise in false economy, and to compare the good that has been done by this program with the incredibly mediocre results of several more expensive programs aimed at the welfare of the poor. It is hard to believe that Congress can allow this program of obvious results and acceptances to die in order that wildly speculative programs on the domestic front be born. It is discouraging to see that once a domestic program has indeed proven itself in the marketplace of public acceptance, it is no longer worthy of administration support. I sincerely hope that many of my colleagues will join me in demonstrating to the administration that it is a mistake to curtail these programs and in refunding the school milk program to its present effective levels.

At this point I should like to introduce into the body of the RECORD a letter I received from the district supervisor of food services in a Minnesota school district. The letter is self-explanatory, and reflects the same concern that is being expressed across the Nation:

INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 281,  
Robbinsdale, Minn., February 9, 1966.

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are concerned to learn of the additional cut in the Federal appropriation for the special milk program and of the fact that the budget request for the next year will be cut by about two-thirds for the milk program. In addition to this cut, our great concern is the cut in the school lunch appropriation for next year and the probable offering of fewer commodities for use in the lunch program.

We feel we have an excellent lunch program in our district, which is the third largest in the State of Minnesota. We have between 60 and 70 percent participation in our lunch program. While we are not in an economically depressed area, we still feel this program fills a need for our students. They do learn to eat a good balanced meal and often learn to eat foods they do not have at home.

Since President Johnson said in his budget message to the Nation that he "wished to improve the nutrition of the Nation's children," we strongly feel that these budget cuts are contradictory to his message.

We urge you to consider these facts and do what you can to prevent this reduction of school lunch funds.

Sincerely yours,

JOYCE BRADLEY,  
District Supervisor of Food Services.

#### EDUCATION: CONGRESS IS FACED WITH SOME TRYING ALTERNATIVES

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the 89th Congress has during the 1st session

already compiled an extraordinary record of achievement in the field of education. Members of Congress will therefore study with particular care President Johnson's proposals for implementing the education measures passed during 1965 and also during the 88th Congress as well as his proposals for the year ahead.

One of the most thoughtful discussions I have seen of the President's education proposals for fiscal year 1967 is an article by John Walsh in the February 4, 1966, issue of *Science* magazine, a publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Under unanimous consent I insert this article, "Education: Congress Is Faced With Some Trying Alternatives," at this point in the RECORD.

**EDUCATION: CONGRESS IS FACED WITH SOME TRYING ALTERNATIVES**

When the Federal budget is revealed to public view its general features are obvious, but details are not. At first, it is difficult to see the trees for the wood. Second thoughts often follow a second look.

As the President said in his budget message, "A budget is not simply a schedule of financial accounts.

"It is a program for action."

A budget is also a political document and can be compared, not unreasonably, to the opening bet in a hand of poker.

The budget for fiscal 1967 calls for record expenditures (\$112.8 billion) and forecasts what, under the circumstances, is a remarkably small deficit (\$1.8 billion). In order to finance the Vietnam war and a number of new programs without resorting to higher expenditures and a bigger deficit, a number of existing programs have been put to the budgetary knife (*Science*, Jan. 28).

The budget of the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare offers an illustration of how this has been done. Total funds administered by the Office of Education would rise by some \$174 million to a total \$3.5 billion in the coming fiscal year. This \$174 million, however, is a net figure. Increases totaling \$561 million would be strongly off-set by cuts amounting to \$387 million.

The most conspicuous cuts in education programs would be (i) \$191 million in assistance to school districts with sizable numbers of children of Federal employees enrolled; (ii) \$12 million in special appropriations for land grant institutions; and (iii) merger of the National Defense Education Act loan program for undergraduates and graduate students with the loan insurance program which was part of the Higher Education Act passed last year. A system of private loans to students would be substituted for the present program of Federal loans to students made through colleges and universities. The result would be a cut of \$149 million in Federal expenditures.

The administration argues that these cuts would be compensated for by funds available under new or expanded programs. But with enrollments and costs increasing in education, cuts, or changes that can be interpreted as cuts, are likely to be opposed. And in the case of the funds for federally impacted schools and for land-grant institutions, it is—to mix a metaphor—sacred oxen which would be gored.

Resistance is likely to rally most quickly against the proposed cut of \$11,950,000 out of a total of \$14,500,000 in annual appropriations for "resident instruction" in land-grant institutions.

The Federal Government, under the proposal, would continue to pay the \$2,550,000 in permanent appropriations which the land-grant colleges and universities have

been receiving since the late 19th century. The cut would affect the so-called special appropriations which have been increased from time to time as enrollment and the cost of higher education has risen.

Administration spokesmen have observed that the funds for the land grants are no longer needed because of the advent of other types of Federal aid. The reply to this from land-grant partisans is that these Federal appropriations are among the most useful funds these institutions receive, since they can be used where they are needed most, while other Federal programs are categorical in the sense that funds are earmarked for specific uses. Most of the land-grant funds are used to pay faculty salaries and are regarded as replacing income for endowments, which most land-grant institutions have in comparatively meager amounts.

Each of the land-grant institutions would continue to receive a flat \$50,000 a year. But the reduction in appropriations for individual institutions would probably fall most heavily on institutions with predominantly Negro enrollments in Southern States. Many of these were originally "separate but equal" facilities which have been underfinanced and still depends on Federal land-grant funds for very significant parts of their budgets. In bigger, richer institutions, losses would be proportionally smaller, but they would have considerable impact. Cornell University, for example, has been receiving nearly \$600,000 a year in land-grant funds, and if it lost all but \$50,000 a year, the equivalent endowment needed to replace these funds, at a return of 5 percent a year on investments, would be some \$11 million.

The land-grant colleges and universities have considered themselves, on fairly strong evidence to be enjoying a kind of most-favored-institutions status in their relations with the Federal Government, and the administration proposal is sure to kindle re-reminders, whether Congress follows the recommendations or not.

The proposal to reduce funds to school districts also would affect a program which has grown familiar and acquired flavor in a large number of school districts (some 4,100). Impacted-area funds are now counted on by the budget makers in most of these school districts, and reductions would doubtless raise an alarm which would be echoed in Congress.

The main effect of the new and fairly complicated proposal would be to require school districts to "absorb" more of the cost of educating children of Federal employees, especially those who work, but do not live, on Federal property.

Funds in the two programs which make up impacted aid would be cut to a total \$206.3 million, as compared with some \$397 million in the current fiscal year.

The number of school districts receiving aid would be reduced by about 1,000, to around 3,100. By coincidence or something else, \$191 million to be saved under the proposed cuts in impacted school aid equals the \$191 million which would be added to appropriations for the new elementary and secondary education bill passed last year. Much of this new money would benefit children from low-income families. Ironically, many of the school districts which stand to lose eligibility for impacted-area aid are big-city districts with serious slum school problems. Loss of impacted-aid funds, the argument goes, would reduce the effectiveness of the money to be received for the education of the economically and socially deprived.

More uncertainties and much money are involved in the proposed merger of the program of direct Federal loans with the new loan insurance program for students in higher education. The new program is really a troika arrangement. Private lending institutions, such as banks, would provide loan

funds. State and nonprofit private student loan programs would guarantee the loans. The Federal Government would pay interest while the student was pursuing his studies, and 3 percentage points of interest afterward for students from families with annual incomes below \$15,000. Interest on these loans is not to exceed 6 percent or, in exceptional cases, 7 percent.

A parallel program of "educational opportunity grants" would provide \$70 million a year for 3 years for grants of from \$200 to \$800 a year for "exceptionally needy" students. Financial need is now a factor in award of NDEA loans, and students with serious financial needs would presumably be taken care of by the new opportunity grants if the NDEA loan system were merged with the bigger loan insurance program.

The administration has said the change to private financing will result in a big increase in the number of student borrowers. NDEA funds this year are going to about 319,000 students. The budget message predicted that some 775,000 will participate under the recast loan program.

Critics of the merger point out that the new loan guarantee program is untried and developments are to some extent unpredictable. In many States, no State agency designed or empowered to undertake the guarantee of such loans exists. Many legislatures doubtless will remedy this deficiency, but the question of what happens if they do not hangs in the air.

The legislation has a provision for authorizing a Federal program of insured loans for students who do not have reasonable access to equivalent State or private loan programs and authorizes \$17.5 million for advances to State and private nonprofit programs. But how all this will work is not yet clear.

Expenditures for NDEA loans would be cut by \$149 million in fiscal 1967, leaving some \$30 million which apparently is intended to finance the transition.

Doubts have been raised that the private money market will be able to provide funds for such an expansion of student loans, particularly if another \$150 million in loans now financed by the Treasury is thrown in.

Banks and some other private lending institutions have experience with college loans, but not, obviously, on the scale contemplated. In banking circles there is clearly a sense of gratification at seeing the Federal Government withdrawing their direct action in the loan business. Universities and colleges may also be relieved at giving up some of their activity as lending and collection agencies, particularly since, as the rate of late payment and defaults on NDEA loans indicate, some of them have not been very good at it.

The recent increase in the interest rate and, consequently, in the price of money to lending institutions certainly does not make the 6-percent loans any more attractive to the banks. The fact that the loans are relatively long-term ones is perhaps even more discouraging for the banks. It is generally acknowledged among bankers that student loans under the new program would be more a public service and long-range public-relations effort than a profitmaking proposition.

Another matter which remains in doubt is what will happen to the students whose families are not in the exceptionally needy category yet do not rank as very attractive credit risks.

Representative EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, chairman of the House Higher Education Subcommittee, has been quoted as saying she is not opposed to insured loans but would like to see how they work before seeing direct Federal loans abandoned completely.

While the administration's public explanations of its choices in making cuts in education programs are plausible enough if you accept the administration's assumptions, these three cuts are, in practical terms, al-

most certain to provoke stiff opposition. And the curious thing is that probably nobody knows this better than the President and his legislative advisers. For administration education proposals since the beginning of the Johnson administration have been framed with an almost unerring sense of what was wanted in the education community and what Congress would accept.

It would not take too daring a forecaster to prophesy that the three programs listed here will, when the session is over, be in a condition closer to their present one than to the reduced state the budget projects.

Congress could make compensating cuts elsewhere in the education budget to bring total expenditures close to what the President requests. But most of the programs in question call for levels of spending already authorized by Congress in earlier legislation.

An alternative, of course, would be for Congress to appropriate a larger total. This would imply bigger expenditures, a bigger deficit, and, as a possible consequence, increases in taxes. The President, with his small deficit achieved by cutting fairly close to the quick on some programs and counting on hefty increases in revenues, has moved to avoid bringing up such increases. The next move in the game is up to Congress.

At any rate, it appears that there will be briske interaction between the Executive and Congress than has occurred since President Johnson took office. Outside the defense budget, requests for major increases are likely to be accompanied by recommendations for offsetting cuts in related programs. And the difficult options in the education budget may well presage a similar fate for funds for science.—JOHN WALSH.

#### PRODUCTS OF PROGRESS EXPOSITION

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, last year my home community of South Bend was the site of a new kind of fair. As distinguished from the livestock and baked goods of the traditional fair, this one featured the most advanced achievements of engineering and technology— instruments used and products manufactured by the industries of northern Indiana.

That Products of Progress Exposition of last year was a major success and will be duplicated this year with an even larger show in the University of Notre Dame's modern Stepan Center March 25 through 27. This unusual exposition is sponsored by an unusual group, the Council of Engineering and Technical Societies. That organization brings together the representatives of local branches of 15 engineering and technical societies. The 2,500 engineers, scientists, and technical people, who comprise the membership of those groups meet regularly to keep themselves up to date in their professions. They represent a great store of know-how for local industry, and the Products of Progress Exposition gives the entire community a chance to see their latest handiwork.

I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the Council of Engineering and

Technical Societies, and to urge my neighbors throughout the St. Joseph Valley to take advantage of this excellent display of the technological advancements upon which so much of our prosperity depends.

#### MANDATORY LIFE TERMS FOR NARCOTIC PEDDLERS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the first session of this Congress we have undertaken a vast project which could be of lasting benefit to the youth of this Nation and to the advancement of our national resources. I speak of the expansion of educational programs which were adopted by the Congress and enacted into law. However, all this can go for naught if we tolerate the rising use of marihuana and narcotic drugs among the college students, as evidenced through various newspaper articles throughout the country.

As we try to improve the quality of education, the illegal narcotic pusher demoralizes our youth through the easy access to marihuana and other illegal stimulant or depressive drugs. Thus, we pay doubly once to promote education and secondly to curtail the illegal practice of drug peddling on the campuses of our Nation's schools.

The problem of peddling narcotics, to me, seems one that we should cope with at all times, and because of this fact I am today presenting legislation which would provide for a mandatory life sentence to persons convicted of peddling narcotics through illegal channels.

The present laws are permissive in nature as to the penalty which may be given out by the courts in hearing these cases. They leave it up to individual judges as to the terms of imprisonment, parole, and fines which may be levied against a convicted narcotic peddler or pusher. The legislation I propose today will make it mandatory upon the sentencing jurist to impose a life term upon such peddlers, with no chance for parole at some future date. A strict adherence to the law would go far in curtailing the spread of drug addiction among the people of our Nation.

The recent raid upon the campus of Penn State University netted, if I recall correctly, 37 students who were in possession of marihuana. The Washington, D.C., newspaper columns recently told of area college students openly meeting in certain places and openly discussing their use of marihuana at parties which are organized on the spur of the moment.

If, through the passage of the Lindbergh law, we curtailed the crime of kidnaping; which did not exist to the extent to which narcotic peddling exists, we can vastly cut down upon the peddling of illegal drugs if we take action to impose mandatory life sentences to the in-

dividuals convicted of these illegal transactions.

Strict adherence to the law which I propose today, and hope that Congress will take action upon it without delay, will permit us to use the money we would spend in the rehabilitation of the addicts for programs which would be used to better advantage by this country. Our rehabilitation centers could be used to provide services which would enhance the economy of our Nation.

The ever-present threat of a life term without parole, would make an illegal peddler or pusher of narcotics think twice before setting himself up in this vicious business. I know that we are fully cognizant of the fact that these conditions prevail and it is up to us to take immediate remedial steps and declare a war on these illegal narcotic dealers.

Our path in this endeavor is clearly defined and we must not veer from it now, just to be sorry at a later date.

#### WICHITA FALLS RECORD NEWS OF FEBRUARY 7, 1966

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, writing in the Wichita Falls, Tex., Record News, states quite plainly that "President Johnson deserves our thanks for warning the recipients of American foreign aid that they must help themselves intelligently if they wish to continue to receive it."

Recipients must, he points out, invest the money in agriculture and really needed industries, "must make land reforms and collect taxes even from the rich; they must practice some sort of birth control; and above all, they must neither discourage nor confiscate foreign investment."

Of all the President's conditions, "the last is the most important," Mr. Mowrer believes. "Another improvement, in my eyes," he states, "is the separation between military and economic aid. Military aid should go to firm allies, not to wobbly neutrals."

His analysis is forthright and illuminating, and in the belief that others will find it informative and of value, I offer it for the RECORD.

FAVOR FOR FRIENDS

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson deserves our thanks for warning the recipients of American foreign aid that they must help themselves intelligently if they wish to continue to receive it. They must, that is, invest the money in agriculture and really needed industries (instead of in Rolls Royces, golden bedsteads and steel mills); they must make land reforms and collect taxes even from the rich; they must practice some sort of birth control; and above all, they must neither discourage nor confiscate foreign investment.

Of all L.B.J.'s conditions, the last is the most important. The United States was largely developed by foreign capital. So was Canada. So, before 1914, was Russia. No primitive country has the means of rapid industrial development. Such countries must either welcome foreign investment, or remain undeveloped. To the extent that the President stands firm on this, he will help everybody concerned.

Another improvement, in my eyes, is the separation between military and economic aid. Military aid should go to firm allies, not to wobbly neutrals. Let the latter get arms from Russia or China—if they are ready to face the consequences. Unhappily our President has not yet accepted this bit of commonsense. Perhaps with time, he will.

#### NO CALL FOR SERMONS

What really irks me about the President's aid message to Congress is, however, his sermonizing. Such talk gives the United States a reputation for hypocrisy throughout the world. Over the past 21 years of foreign aid, our chief motive has never been "devotion to the works of peace" or "vision of a world free from fear and ripe with opportunity." Not because most Americans would not welcome these things, but because we had a more immediate goal.

The chief motive of the American Congress in voting a hundred odd billions of foreign aid has been to halt the spread of communism—in short, to achieve at least a draw in the cold war. Any citizen who disagrees should ask himself whether, without the Russo-American and Sino-American competitions for the minds and favor of the undeveloped peoples and governments, the American people would never have approved giving away such astronomical sums.

To be sure, we have achieved much less than we could have. This is because we have allowed people with no practical experience of world politics to persuade us to give "aid without strings." Governments and individuals are properly suspicious of "something for nothing." Moreover, our foolishness has offered shrewd governments in underdeveloped countries a marvelous opportunity to practice "double blackmail" saying to Washington and to Moscow, "Gimme, gimme, or I'll get it from the other place." Even George Kennan, now a champion peacenik, wrote a few years ago that when a chief of state with an itchy palm threatened to go to Moscow unless Washington came across with the dough, a wise American President would have answered, "Go."

Paying and blackmail has two defects. In the first place, the recipient can do what he pleases with the money. Much of it is still being wasted.

And in the second place, by giving aid only for specific purposes, the canny Bolsheviks (not the Chinese) pursued Lenin's great goal—Communist encirclement of capitalism.

#### REDS SEEK SOURCE OF RAW MATERIAL

For the time being, Moscow, though not Peiping, seeks not so much to install Communist regimes as to cut the capitalist countries off from their sources of raw materials in the undeveloped countries. This explains Moscow's interest in fomenting any kind of revolt or disorder in underdeveloped Asia, Africa and Latin America. Hunger in India, civil strife in Africa, putsches in Latin America—these are steps toward the eventual Communist encirclement of capitalism upon which Moscow is counting to buy the West.

To counter this offensive Washington needs to make clear to each undeveloped country that the condition of our aid is a permanently friendly attitude on its part—take it or leave it.

Instead, we give trade and aid without strings not only to unfriendly neutrals but to overt enemies, thus allowing the latter

to step up their aid and hide their economic failures. Small wonder that the West is slowly losing the cold war.

Nothing but a reversal of our aid policy in this respect and a public admission that we favor only those who share our values can make our aid fully effective.

The rest, as the French poet Verlaine wrote, is "literature."

#### FEBRUARY 25, WORLD DAY OF PRAYER

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 25, millions of Americans will once again participate in the World Day of Prayer.

There will be an opportunity for Members of Congress and their staffs to participate by joining others in a quiet service of meditation in room S. 120 in the Capitol on February 25.

The flexible hours of 11 a.m. to 2 p.m. will give each a choice as to a convenient time. A brief meditation will be brought by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris at 12:30 p.m. and one by Dr. Bernard Braskamp at 1:30 p.m. There will be quiet music the remainder of the time and opportunity for individual meditation and prayer for a troubled world.

The World Day of Prayer is sponsored by the United Church Women, and is observed in every continent on the first Friday in Lent. Though begun 80 years ago, it has a realistic, contemporary appeal and need for Christians throughout the world to pray and to witness for Christ in this day of ferment and tension among nations, and especially for the success of our Nation's peace efforts.

I invite each of you and the members of your staffs to share in this experience.

#### SEARCH FOR PEACE

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ANDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, fateful decisions often are forced on Presidents. We recall the decision that Harry Truman had to make when he had faced up to the senseless resistance of the Japanese.

Fateful decisions, such as to resume bombing raids over North Vietnam, are not easy for Presidents to make.

The Nashville Tennessean has pointed out that advisers to the President "told him that if continued immunity were given to those who support Vietnamese aggression the cost in American lives would be greatly increased."

The paper adds that it is clear that the 37-day period "in which Mr. Johnson

sought unsuccessfully in many places for a way to end the fighting in Vietnam—has exposed the Communists before the world as the aggressors in southeast Asia."

According to the Tennessean:

The resumption of the bombing is consistent with the President's policy of impressing upon the North Vietnamese this country's determination to remain in southeast Asia, while pursuing every path that might lead to peace.

The editorial is thought provoking and because many of my colleagues will want to read it through, I suggest that it be included in the RECORD:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean, Feb. 1, 1966]

#### THE SEARCH FOR PEACE MUST STILL BE PUSHED

President Johnson has sent American bombers back over North Vietnam, ending a 37-day lull during which he pushed peace talks around the world. The peace talks will continue—will perhaps be intensified—but the President has decided that the situation can no longer remain static while the Communists build up new stocks of men and material in South Vietnam.

Mr. Johnson coupled his order to resume bombing with instructions to Ambassador Arthur Goldberg to act as quickly as possible to promote peace through the United Nations.

The President's appeal to the U.N. represents a departure from past policy, and indicates that this country will now give more emphasis to convincing the U.N. that Communist aggression in southeast Asia is a world problem, and not one just for the United States alone to deal with.

Heretofore, the administration has welcomed the U.N.'s concern over the Vietnamese war, but it has appeared cool to any suggestion that the U.N. be given a major hand in settling the dispute. Yesterday, however, Mr. Johnson called for an immediate meeting of the U.N. Security Council in an effort to bring the Vietnam conflict to the conference table.

It is uncertain what role the U.N. can play. It seems unlikely that a peace-keeping force could be the answer. But there is no doubt that the problem should be before the U.N. for discussion and for the purpose of engendering whatever pressure the free nations may be able to bring to bear upon the Communist aggressors.

It is widely regretted that the 37-day lull found no favorable Communist response to the President's peace efforts and that he found it necessary to resume the bombing.

However, according to Mr. Johnson, his advisers had told him that if continued immunity were given to those who support Vietnamese aggression the cost in American lives would be greatly increased.

"In the light of the words and actions of the government in Hanoi," he said, "it is our clear duty to do what we can to limit these costs."

Although it is regrettable to see the lull in the bombing come to an end, it is clear that the 37-day period—in which Mr. Johnson sought unsuccessfully in many places for a way to end the fighting in Vietnam—has exposed the Communists before the world as the aggressors in southeast Asia.

Their refusal ever to talk about peace, and their denunciations of Mr. Johnson's efforts, have left most people with the impression that peace is the last thing the Communists want.

The resumption of the bombing is consistent with the President's policy of impressing upon the North Vietnamese this country's determination to remain in southeast Asia, while pursuing every path that might lead to peace.

It is not an easy choice in Vietnam for Mr. Johnson—or for the Nation. It is hoped a way will soon be found to end the fighting, but in view of the latest developments it seems the Nation must be prepared to see the situation get worse before it gets better.

#### ADAM YARMOLINSKY: A FINE AMERICAN AND PUBLIC SERVANT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, on January 25, one of our colleagues saw fit to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Washington Observer containing an unprincipled and totally unwarranted attack on a fine public servant, Adam Yarmolinsky. This kind of attack on Mr. Yarmolinsky has become all too frequent. The constant repetition of this type of falsehood, and the consequent injury to Mr. Yarmolinsky's reputation and career, require that the record be set straight.

I am quite familiar with Adam Yarmolinsky's background, with his record of devoted public service, and with his high professional standards. I know from personal acquaintance, and from a review of the documented facts about his past activities, that he has been a consistent and effective opponent of communism and Communist influence since his early youth.

The various innuendoes contained in the article from the Washington Observer, and in similar scurrilous attacks, will not survive objective analysis of Mr. Yarmolinsky's career, both private and public. The statements of purported fact as to his associations and past activities are demonstrably false.

For example, Mr. Speaker, the Washington Observer article states that while at Harvard Mr. Yarmolinsky was head of the campus Marxist Club. This charge is completely baseless. The fact is that, while at Harvard, Mr. Yarmolinsky and a group of his friends withdrew from the Harvard Student Union because of its developing pro-Communist bias. They then founded the Harvard Liberal Union, which strongly supported American assistance to the British war effort at a time when the Nazi-Soviet Pact was in effect. Its positions were not Marxist, but actively anti-Communist.

The article also asserts that Mr. Yarmolinsky was a founding member and on the editorial staff of the "campus Marxist magazine Yardling, which presented to students the viewpoint of the Young Communist League." Again, the statement is completely erroneous. While at Harvard, Mr. Yarmolinsky was instrumental in founding a freshman newspaper known as the Harvard Yardling. This publication lasted for six issues. Not one of these issues contained any material whatsoever of a pro-Communist or fellow traveler nature. The Yardling was completely nonpolitical. It concentrated on matters of interest to Harvard freshmen, and emphasized sports and social activities. This distorted description of the nature of the

Harvard Yardling appears to have originated in the notorious anti-Semitic hate sheet, Common Sense. It is without factual foundation.

The Observer articles states further, Mr. Speaker, that, in 1941 while a student at Harvard, Mr. Yarmolinsky attended the Communist-controlled American Youth Congress. What it fails to state is that he was present at this meeting of the American Youth Congress as a hostile observer to see how that organization would try to get out of its previous anti-intervention position following Russian's entry into the war the month before. Mr. Yarmolinsky prepared a report on this meeting, published by the Clearinghouse for Youth Groups, in which he commented on the AYC "flip-flop" and observed that this showed that the Youth Congress was "completely under the domination of the Communists." His report warned of the likelihood of attempts by the Youth Congress to infiltrate non-Communist student groups.

With regard to the article's charges of affiliation with the Young Communist League, these too are arrant falsehoods. Mr. Yarmolinsky was never a member of or sympathetic with the Young Communist League. Instead, his record shows constant opposition to Communist attempts to infiltrate the organizations with which he has been associated. As a result of his efforts to combat Communist attempts to take over the American Veterans Committee in 1946, Mr. Yarmolinsky was attacked as a "Red baiter" in columns of the New York Daily Worker.

Mr. Speaker, other misrepresentations of this article relate to Mr. Yarmolinsky's parents and to his work on a study of the Federal personnel security system. Insofar as his parents are concerned, both Dr. and Mrs. Yarmolinsky are distinguished scholars and writers. Neither has been active politically. Dr. Yarmolinsky, furthermore, has come under attack in Communist publications because of his unfavorable comments about the status of Russian literature under the Soviet regime. Mrs. Yarmolinsky, a well-known poet under her pen name, "Babette Deutsch," was among the first to call attention to the importance of Boris Pasternak's "Dr. Zhivago," in an article in Harper's magazine in September of 1958, shortly after the Pasternak manuscript was smuggled out of the Soviet Union.

Insofar as the study of the Federal personnel security system is concerned, this was an objective analysis of 50 loyalty-security cases, which was designed to provide factual material which might lead to procedural improvements in that program. The study in no sense constituted an attack on efforts to achieve personnel security and, in his published comments at the time of the study, Mr. Yarmolinsky recorded his view that a security program was "needed in these days when there is a danger of Communist subversion."

Mr. Yarmolinsky has had a distinguished career both as a private lawyer and as a public servant. The baseless charges that have been made against

him in a number of radical hate sheets merit only the contempt of this body and the American public.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that when they know the facts, none of our colleagues, and indeed no responsible individuals, will associate themselves with this kind of unprincipled attack on an able and loyal American.

#### RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE DELAWARE CHAPTER OF THE UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was adopted by the Delaware chapter of the United World Federalists at a chapter meeting held February 8, 1966:

#### RESOLUTIONS ON U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM ADOPTED AT THE MEETING, FEBRUARY 8, 1966, OF THE DELAWARE CHAPTER OF THE UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS

We believe that these resolutions describe the kind of constructive policy the United States ought to emphasize rather than one of escalation.

1. The United States should continue vigorously to seek negotiations with the North Vietnamese Government. We approve the recent offer to include the National Liberation Front in the negotiations. Meanwhile we urge restraint to prevent widening the conflict.

2. We approve of the steps the United States has taken in bringing this crisis to the United Nations and believe that fullest use should be made of the United Nations and of the good offices of nations near Vietnam in the search for peace and in guaranteeing any agreement.

3. We commend the U.S. Government's recognition of the validity of the 1954 Geneva accord.

4. Initiatives should be taken to bring mainland China into increased contact with the United States and the world community.

5. In cooperation with other governments, the U.S. Government should prepare concrete proposals to strengthen the United Nations to give it authority and means to cope with future crises.

We proudly commend our Representative HARRIS B. McDOWELL for his efforts to bring the problem of the Vietnam war before the United Nations.

We proudly commend our Senator J. CALIB BOGGS for his part in providing the people of the United States with the report, "The Vietnam Conflict: The Substance and the Shadow," a vitally important document.

#### ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT T. MURPHY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years the tremendous growth in air traffic as well as air cargo and air freight has been a remarkable factor in our national economy. The air transportation industry has reached a period of its highest prosperity and stability under a regulatory climate provided by the Civil Aeronautics Board in which it has been encouraged to grow and develop to the fullest extent of its ability. Today we

have the best air transportation system in the world, both domestically and internationally. Puerto Rico and the Caribbean region constitutes a very significant part of our overseas and international trade and commerce.

In this connection, a recent speech by the Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Robert T. Murphy, of Rhode Island, to the Chamber of Commerce of Puerto Rico in San Juan on February 12 appropriately touches upon some of these significant considerations.

As Mr. Murphy points out, it has been air transportation which has forged the links which permit the flow of our trade and commerce to and from Puerto Rico in a matter of a few hours at a level of very reasonable cost. Today, as we know, Puerto Rico is the crossroads of Caribbean air traffic and will continue to play a very important part in the future development of the entire Caribbean region.

Under previous unanimous consent I insert his timely statement in the body of the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT T. MURPHY, VICE CHAIRMAN, CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, BEFORE THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF PUERTO RICO IN SAN JUAN, FEBRUARY 12, 1966

I am honored to be here in the company of the Puerto Rico Chamber of Commerce this evening. Your invitation to join with you in emphasizing the essential importance of our national air transportation system in the advancement of your economic and social welfare has afforded me the first opportunity to visit this great Commonwealth. As I told your President, Mr. Justo Pastor Rivera, in Washington a few weeks ago, I have come not primarily to speak but rather, to listen; not to lecture, but to learn. I want to acquire a greater familiarity with your problems, to understand them the better and to consider them as they relate on the larger scene of America's national interest.

This is not to say that I have no previous acquaintance with the needs and aspirations of Puerto Rico—its record of progressive self-development and its impressive achievements. In frequent cases and conferences during the past 5 years—in which the Commonwealth has often participated—I have acquired a keen appreciation of the special importance of this Commonwealth in the present and future development of our American way of life in this offshore Caribbean area. The ever-unfolding economic drama of Operation Bootstrap with which so many of you here tonight are personally identified, is an inspirational example of self-reliance and self-development with which all men in all parts of the world interested in the cause of freedom and human dignity, are and should be acquainted.

And we know that Puerto Ricans have initiated another operation—Operation Serenidad—to lend the proper cultural and spiritual framework to the material advancement sought by your quickened trade and commerce. Coming from a part of the United States which takes special pride in its colonial history, I cannot help but be impressed with the antiquity of your culture and institutions. This island had been colonized for more than a century before my native city was founded by Roger Williams in 1636; the hostile incursions of the British and Dutch had long been repulsed from the battlements of Morro Castle before the colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations received its charter from King Charles II in 1663. Certainly, no other area under the American flag can boast of a more ancient and impressive heritage than the Commonwealth of

Puerto Rico. Nor, indeed, is any other more noted for its natural beauty and the kind hospitality of its people. It is a pleasure, indeed, to be here at last.

But our interest, in this convocation, is not so much in what is past; rather, our concern is what the attendant fortunes of our modern industrial world hold in store for Puerto Rico in the days ahead and how air transportation can be relied upon to play a continuing role of service in that respect.

For generations, as an insular community, Puerto Rico was completely dependent upon maritime transport for its association with the outside world. Trading ships which have traversed these waters since the days of Columbus and, more recently, cruise ships have played a vital part in your economic development. Without any intention of suggesting that air transport could supplant the continuing importance of maritime transport to the Commonwealth, which must be relied upon for the chief carriage of bulk and heavy goods, I think we can truly say that it is air transportation which has facilitated, in recent years, the astounding increases in your trade and commerce. It has been the aircraft which forged the vital links which now permit the swift flow of persons and goods to and from your principal mainland markets in a matter of a few hours at reasonable costs. It has been air transportation which has joined you to all the Caribbean basic communities with ease and swiftness and brought to you ready transport communication with the major communities of Europe and South America. It is air transportation which is helping to banish the fear of isolation and the sense of division which, in the past, has gripped so many of the Caribbean basin peoples.

By virtue of air transportation, the resplendent charms of this island have been made immediately available, at prices reasonably related to costs, to literally hundreds of thousands of people in the United States and elsewhere. Here, at San Juan's International Airport, multiple carriers vie with one another in providing an excellence of service with the most modern aircraft at a variety of price levels.

Last year, while maritime transport afforded you 55 sailings each month to 18 ports, you enjoyed some 156 direct flights each week to U.S. markets, plus Latin America and Europe. Eleven airlines transported more than 100 tons of air cargo daily—and the growth and development of economically priced air freight the air cargo will figure more and more in your commercial future. Certainly, the contributions of civil air transport technology and of progressive air carrier management can find no better proving ground than in the pattern of air services available at your International Airport. They have made you the crossroads of Caribbean air traffic.

But while your present air transportation facilities are excellent we, at the Civil Aeronautics Board, fully appreciate that your service requirements continue to expand; that as your needs grow, so too must your air transport horizons be enlarged. We have full confidence in the responsiveness of the authorized carriers to meet the increased demands for services. We know that industry, which has supplanted agriculture as the prime factor in the Puerto Rican economy, requires rapid and reasonably priced air transportation in order to maintain its position in the swiftly evolving economy of the modern-day world. Likewise, we are aware of the special dependence of tourism—now the third-ranking contributor to your economy—upon the continued development and enlargement of convenient and reasonably priced air transportation services.

The dramatic growth in air travel is nowhere better illustrated than in the New York-San Juan market which has expanded threefold in the past decade and which we

can expect to total almost 1.3 million passengers in 1966. In a sense, the variety in the classes of service made available to you by the carriers has been both a cause and an effect of your great traffic growth both in this and other markets. The price range and choice of services, surely a function of the competitive route awards made by the CAB, have been a stimulus in this development. It is well to note that the lowest round-trip New York-San Juan fare today is less than half the figure in 1946—and the New York-San Juan thrift fare is one of the lowest mileage fares in the entire world.

An equally striking demonstration of the impact of air travel on Caribbean economies can be found in the San Juan-Virgin Island markets so ably served by your home-based Caribair (Lineas Aereas de Puerto Rico). Between 1952 and 1964, Caribair's traffic between San Juan and St. Thomas rose from 59,000 to 433,000 and from San Juan to St. Croix from 9,000 to 69,000—an eightfold increase.

Now, as you doubtless know, an extensive review of all present United States-Caribbean-South American air services is proceeding before our Board. Detailed evidence relating to your present and future needs for air service has been submitted in this quasi-judicial proceeding. I cannot comment on that pending case except to say that you may be assured that it will be fully and carefully considered and evaluated in keeping with our Board responsibility to develop an adequate national air transport system capable of meeting the needs of our present and future domestic and international trade and commerce.

I deem it fortunate that so much of your future will be identified with air transportation which, in my judgment, is our most progressive and dynamic mode of transportation. I say that for several reasons:

First, in aviation technology, including aircraft design and production, we are unquestionably world leaders. U.S. aircraft are in use, in increasing numbers, under the flags of all of the free world, over air routes in every corner of the globe. Yet, our search for even better aircraft products continues at an accelerated pace.

Second, our air carrier industry has built the most extensive, the soundest, and most economically viable air transportation system in the world. In terms of service to the public it has no peer elsewhere. In profitability to investors it has no counterpart. Our airline managements have courageously committed billions of dollars to making the jet age a reality for the millions of travelers and shippers now regularly utilizing their safe and reliable services.

And, finally, we can say with some pardonable pride, that a regulatory climate and attitude has been provided by the CAB in which air transportation has been encouraged to grow and develop at a maximized pace relatively free from discouraging regulatory burdens or undue restrictions.

As you contemplate the future, therefore, you can confidently conclude that the air transport industry is not afflicted with any serious ills. Its problems, fortunately, are chiefly those associated with growth, of burgeoning expansion and, indeed, affluence. This past year, our carriers, both domestic and international, set new traffic record highs in every category of market indexes—and, at the same time achieved the most favorable profit returns in many years. This trend continues. The latest figures available show, for example, that December 1965 trunkline traffic was up 6.2 percent over November 1965 and up 22 percent over December 1964. Load factors are continuing to hold steady even as the number of seats made available for sale continues to rise.

Our air transport industry, then, stands fully able and ever willing to join with you in lifting your economy to new heights.

Airline managements are devoting an increasing proportion of their attention and resources to improvement of their services as well as innovations in the promotion of resort and tourist travel. You cannot help but profit from all of this.

There can be no reasonable doubt that the years ahead are destined to be years of great promise and dramatic growth in all modes of air transportation. According to reliable forecasts, the record levels of 1965 will be exceeded this year—and the totals of passengers and passenger-miles will double within the next 5 years. In my judgment, air cargo and air freight will grow at a relatively higher pace than passenger traffic. New containerization methods will greatly facilitate its handling and its intermodal transfer thus reducing costs appreciably. More and more of our traffic will be carried in jet aircraft. Here in the Caribbean area, for example, you can soon expect marked service improvements with advent of the three-engine B-727's and twin-engine DC-9's by Pan Am and your own Caribbean-Atlantic respectively.

Time does not permit a glimpse of what the future may hold for us in terms of supersonic transportation or in terms of the projected mammoth, subsonic cargo and passenger aircraft of the C-5A type. Nor can we discuss, at this point, the great transport breakthroughs which may result from the advancing technology in V/STOL aircraft—both fixed and tilt wing—or in the special research in ballistic transport which accompanies our space efforts. Right now, on the drawing boards and in the laboratories of our world-famed aircraft manufacturing industry, revolutionary new advances in equipment are presently in the making. Suffice it to say that even with the present tools at hand our basic air transportation system will expand beyond present markets. Air carrier progress will stimulate the development of new markets. As businessmen, you appreciate that the growth and development of other travel markets need not adversely affect Puerto Rico's prime tourist position. Experience has shown that the great expansion of Caribbean air travel has been accompanied by a healthy growth in the Florida market; vacation travel to the southwestern States has rapidly grown concomitantly with the dramatic increases in tourist traffic to Hawaii. There are benefits for all of us in the expansion of additional travel markets.

In this connection let me compliment you on the establishment of the Caribbean Economic Development Corporation whose activities recognize that the continuing prosperity of Puerto Rico is necessarily associated with that of the other islands in the Caribbean region. Just as the Island of Oahu in our new State of Hawaii perceived that its destiny was inevitably linked to the development of the "outer islands," so, too, have you recognized that the promotion of the neighboring islands as tourist attractions will redound to your own benefit. An upsurge in their economy will have a favorable effect upon that of Puerto Rico.

I cannot conclude these remarks without advertising to the unique position which the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the neighboring Virgin Islands enjoy in our efforts to promote and advance the Visit U.S.A. program. Here, the favorable virtues of climate, geographic location, cultural background, scenic beauty, and historic lore combine to make the Commonwealth and its environs a highly attractive center of vacation travel. The principal instrument of its development along these lines will continue to be air transportation. In the Caribbean basin, we can find all the charms and allure of the multinational civilization of Europe, and find them literally on our own doorstep, thanks to convenient airline services. Not only are more and more of our fellow citizens

discovering this pleasurable fact but, likewise, more and more Europeans. The work of this chamber, then, in the development of a strong tourist economy in the Commonwealth is a significant contribution to our balance-of-payments problem. You are to be commended for your efforts in this direction.

In conclusion then, let me say that the future for Puerto Rico is indeed bright and that developing future will continue to be enhanced by progressive and reliable air transportation services. In your effort to improve your self-governing capacity by expanding your economy and opening new vistas of spiritual and cultural values to your people, you may count our flag carriers as your strong, faithful allies. I am sure that all of us who are privileged to have some responsibility for U.S. air transportation shall regard our obligations to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico as a responsibility of great trust—a trust which I assure you will be discharged with fidelity and continued success.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER (at the request of Mr. Boggs), on February 21 and 22, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. KREBS), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCDOWELL (at the request of Mr. KREBS), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. KREBS), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. WELTNER.

Mr. PHILBIN.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DEL CLAWSON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KREBS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HAYS.

Mr. HANNA.

Mr. KORNEGAY in two instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey.

#### JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States

to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 22d World Health Assembly in Boston, Mass., in 1969.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 22, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2058. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for various agencies for fiscal year 1966 (H. Doc. No. 383); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2059. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of audit of Farm Credit Administration, fiscal year 1965 (H. Doc. No. 384); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

2060. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the provisions of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2061. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2062. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2063. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report covering personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations, during the period July 1 through December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 203(o) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2064. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need to reexamine planned replacement and augmentation of high-endurance vessels, western area, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2065. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of information relating to local employment created by the accelerated public works program, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2066. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of actions being taken to achieve greater utilization of limited-life and long-supply items in civil defense medical stockpile managed by Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2067. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of pricing of recorders purchased from Midwestern Instruments, Inc., Tulsa, Okla., Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2068. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of cost-sharing arrangements with the State of Oregon for the operation of fish hatcheries, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2069. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need to strengthen supervision over city delivery carriers, Post Office Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2070. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of allocation of school facility costs to five federally assisted urban renewal projects in New Jersey and Illinois, Urban Renewal Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2071. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need to consider storing processed commodities on a daily-rate basis, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2072. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of inclusion of balconies and use of high-cost brick in constructing low-rent public housing projects, Public Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2073. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of the approval of mortgage insurance for a housing project for the elderly located near Fort Worth, Tex., Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2074. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 248, *The Seminole Nation, Plaintiff v. The United States of America*, pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 707; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2075. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to give the Federal Communications Commission certain additional regulatory authority over communication common carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2076. A letter from the Secretary, Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide incentives to planned metropolitan development and to otherwise assist urban development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1293). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 12921. A bill to amend Public Law 660, 86th Congress, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and vigorous application of findings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 12922. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 12923. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 12924. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12925. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the millennium of the Polish nation in the calendar year 1966; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 12926. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove certain limitations on the amount of the deduction for contributions to pension and profit-sharing plans made on behalf of self-employed individuals and to change the definition of "earned income" applicable with respect to such plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 12927. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall acquire additional land for the Beverly National Cemetery, N.J.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 12928. A bill to amend titles III and XI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to strengthen instruction in school health and physical education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 12929. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 12930. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, to extend such mailing privileges to voice recordings of personal messages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 12931. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide increased authorization for the lending programs of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12932. A bill to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 12933. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12934. A bill to permit a State to elect to use funds from the highway trust fund for purposes of urban mass transportation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 12935. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that construction workers shall be allowed the deduction for moving expenses without regard to the length of time they are employed at their new location; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 12936. A bill relating to the establishment of parking facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 12937. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1924, to revise existing law relating to the examination, licensure, registration, and regulation of optometrists and the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 12938. A bill relating to the establishment of parking facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 12939. A bill to provide incentives to planned metropolitan development and to otherwise assist urban development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 12940. A bill relating to the establishment of parking facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 12941. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 12942. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CRALEY:

H.R. 12943. A bill to extend the administrative compensation retention provisions of the Department of the Navy for its wage board employees to wage board employees of the former Naval Ordnance Plant, York, Pa.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 12944. A bill authorizing the planting, design, construction, furnishing, and maintenance of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 12945. A bill to provide that certain persons convicted of peddling narcotics must be sentenced to life imprisonment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 12946. A bill to provide incentives to planned metropolitan development and to otherwise assist urban development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 1966, the following bill was reported on February 18, 1966:

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 12889. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, evaluation, and

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.J. Res. 840. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation for the commemoration and observance of the millennium of the Polish nation in the calendar year 1966; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.J. Res. 841. Joint resolution to designate Monday, October 4, 1965, as Free Enterprise Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H. Con. Res. 595. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to discrimination in the assignment of U.S. employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.:

H.R. 12947. A bill for the relief of John A. Goodwin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12948. A bill for the relief of Mary Seferian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 12949. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko Ishizawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 12950. A bill for the relief of Kazimierz (Casimer) Krzykowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 12951. A bill for the relief of Dr. Syed Akram Ali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12952. A bill for the relief of Wlodzimirz Kwolek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12953. A bill for the relief of Jozef Misiuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 12954. A bill for the relief of Vukosava Nikcevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 12955. A bill for the relief of Arlene W. Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 12956. A bill for the relief of Chana Stupinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12957. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Jackowski, Joanna Jackowski, Stefan Jackowski, Waclaw Jackowski, and Tomasz Jackowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

330. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to Federal aid in certain areas and cutting of school lunch funds, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

## SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God of the ages, we come to Thee in this day and age conscious of a serious world situation. We give Thee thanks for citizenship in a free nation where dif-

ference of opinion sincerely and fervently debated gives opportunity for solemn thought of men's actions and persuasions throughout the world. We thank Thee that within this company of leaders there is a deep desire to find a solution.

Thou art the God of Peace for all people. Move, therefore, with Thy guiding presence upon this body in their deliberations. Create through them ways of peace. Give them courage to dare to take guided steps. Reward them with inner strength and security.

Direct the President, the Congress, and other world leaders that this day will not be remembered as a prelude to war but a day and age of seeking and developing a lasting peace. We pray in the Master's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HART, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 18, 1966, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

#### REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH UNDER TITLE II OF DUAL COMPENSATION ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

As provided by section 205 of title II of the Dual Compensation Act (Public Law 88-448, approved Aug. 19, 1964), I am transmitting a comprehensive report of the operations under that title of the departments and agencies in the executive branch.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 21, 1966.

#### LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. HART, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, February 21, 1966, the President pro tempore signed the enrolled bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

#### REPORT OF AUDIT OF NATIONAL FUND FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the executive vice president, National Fund for Medical Education, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of audit of that fund, for the calendar year 1965, which, with the accompanying report was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM—RESOLUTION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution of the senate and house education committees of the General Assembly of the State of Vermont. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

This resolution strongly protests the recommendations of the administration for drastic cuts in the school milk and school lunch programs, holding that such an action would not be in the best interests of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

#### RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF VERMONT

Whereas the national school lunch program and the special school milk program are two of the most valuable programs provided by the Federal Government for the children of America; and

Whereas the well-being and the learning rate of children are greatly improved by the availability of these programs with adequate Federal support; and

Whereas the programs have a salutary effect on the agricultural economy of the country; and

Whereas since the programs are available to children whether or not the parents have the ability to pay, that this is a service provided to all without discrimination; and

Whereas these programs help to build healthy minds and healthy bodies in children and develop in them good nutritional habits that will be with them through their lives; and

Whereas the future of the United States depends on the well-being of the children in the schools today and a continuance of this well-being into adulthood; and

Whereas the senate and house education committees are certain that the drastic cuts in the financial support for the national school lunch program and special milk program for fiscal 1967 is not in the best interests of the country: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the senate and house education committees, That the President of the United States and the Congress take steps to reevaluate the values of the national school lunch program and the special milk program and take the necessary steps not only to restore the proposed cuts in the budget in fiscal 1967 for these programs, but to increase the appropriations made in fiscal 1966 to a level which recognizes the substantial growth in these programs and the increased cost in operating them; and be it further*